UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-EIGHTH YEAR

2423rd MEETING: 25 MARCH 1983

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2423)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
Letter dated 22 March 1983 from the Deputy Minister for External Relations of Nicaragua addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15651)	1

best copy available

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/ . . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

2423rd MEETING

Held in New York on Friday, 25 March 1983, at 3.30 p.m.

President: Sir John THOMSON (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland)

Present: The representatives of the following States: China, France, Guyana, Jordan, Malta, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Poland, Togo, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire, Zimbabwe.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2423)

1. Adoption of the agenda

2. Letter dated 22 March 1983 from the Deputy Minister for External Relations of Nicaragua addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15651)

The meeting was called to order at 4 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Letter dated 22 March 1983 from the Deputy Minister for External Relations of Nicaragua addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15651)

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decisions taken at previous meetings on this item [*2420th to 2422nd meetings*], I invite the representative of Honduras to take a place at the Council table; I invite the representatives of Algeria, Barbados, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Grenada, India, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritius, Mexico, Panama, the Philippines, Spain the United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela and Viet Nam to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Ortez Colindres (Honduras) took a place at the Council table; Mr. Abada (Algeria), Mr. Moseley (Barbados), Mr. Sanz de Santamaria (Colombia), Mr. Zumbado Jiménez (Costa Rica), Mr. Roa Kourí (Cuba), Mr. Al-Alfi (Democratic Yemen), Mr. Albornoz (Ecuador), Mr. Taylor (Grenada), Mr. Purushottam (India), Mr. Treiki (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Mr. Maudave (Mauritius), Mr. Muñoz Ledo (Mexico), Mr. Ozores Typaldos (Panama), Mr. Arcilla (Philippines), Mr. de Piniés (Spain), Mr. Rupia (United Republic of Tanzania), Mrs. Coronel de Rodriguez (Venezuela) and Mr. Hoang Bich Son (Viet Nam) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

2. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, the Dominican Republic, the Federal Republic of Germany and the Islamic Republic of Iran in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Miss Dever (Belgium), Mr. Salazar Paredes (Bolivia), Mr. Bittencourt (Brazil), Miss Castillo (Dominican Republic), Mr. Jelonek (Federal Republic of Germany) and Mr. Serajzadeh (Islamic Republic of Iran) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

3. Mr. SINCLAIR (Guyana): Sir, representing, as you do, a country with which Guyana enjoys cordial and friendly relations, it gives me special pleasure to welcome your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of March. You bring to this high office, in addition to your well-known qualities as a diplomat, your methodical, efficient manner, which together give us assurance that under your stewardship the Council will effectively and successfully discharge its responsibilities.

4. I must also take this opportunity to express to your predecessor, Mr. Oleg Troyanovsky of the Soviet Union, my delegation's appreciation for the very capable and smooth manner in which he conducted the business of the Council during February.

5. It was exactly one year ago that the Government of Nicaragua requested the convening of the Council [*S/14913*] to consider the dangerous situation existing in Central America. In the course of the meetings following that request, our attention was drawn to the overt threats of destabilization and harassment being made against Nicaragua and the preparations being made for intervention through the equipping and training of members of the former Somoza National Guard in a territory neighbouring Nicaragua. The Council was warned on that occasion that this situation posed a serious threat to the peace and security of the region, with consequences extending even beyond it.

6. Recent events have served to give even further confirmation of the correctness of the analyses made in 1982. The fears we expressed then are being vindicated by the actions of the same States which were then accused of aggressive and threatening behaviour. As a State of the Latin American and Caribbean region, Guyana has been following with concern the marked deterioration in the situation in parts of Central America, and it is with compelling necessity that we join our voice with those of the delegations which have preceded us in making that concern public.

7. My delegation listened with care as the Deputy Minister for External Relations of Nicaragua recounted [*2420th meeting*] recent developments in, and in relation to, his country. We have taken note of the massive infiltration of members of the former Somoza National Guard from across Nicaragua's northern border, some penetrating as far as Matagalpa, in the vicinity of Rio Blanco. My delegation sincerely regrets the loss of Nicaraguan life which has followed these infiltrations and fully shares the assessment of the Nicaraguan Government regarding a possible internationalization of the conflict in the region.

8. I wish to state at the outset that it is my delegation's understanding that the Council is convened, not to sit in judgement against the institutions or the policies which the Government of Nicaragua has decided to put in place or to implement in order to secure the political, social and economic advancement of the people of Nicaragua. To advance a criticism of any such internal arrangements as a reason, or even a justification, for harassing the Nicaraguan Government constitutes a flagrant violation of the sovereignty and independence of Nicaragua, an interference in that country's internal affairs and a breach of the Charter of the United Nations. No State has the right to dictate to the people of Nicaragua how they should organize their internal affairs. The political reality of the Latin American and Caribbean region is one of ideological pluralism. Any attempt to impose hegemony or ideological conformity on the States of the region constitutes a violation of our sovereign independence and is bound to lead to relations of tension, distrust and instability.

9. At any rate I must recall, as a parenthesis, that for 45 years the people of Nicaragua endured Somoza's tyranny, with no corresponding concern being raised in the Council for democratic freedoms or for a more even distribution of the country's wealth. Now that for the first time the people of Nicaragua are given an opportunity to organize their affairs for their own benefit and advancement, attempts are being made to frustrate and divert those efforts.

10. What the Council is convened to consider is the complaint by the Government of Nicaragua regarding the dangerous situation created by the intensified attempts at destabilizing the Government of that country and at destroying its successful revolution—attempts organized, financed, supported and loudly proclaimed from outside and involving the use of the territory of a neighbouring State as a springboard for attacks by mercenaries and dissidents against the political independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Nicaragua.

11. It was little more than two months ago that the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of member States of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Countries met in the Nicaraguan capital in extraordinary session, from 10 to 14 January, to address their attention to the situation in Latin America and the Caribbean. The preoccupations expressed by the Ministers were sustained by the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, which met at New Delhi from 7 to 12 March and in relation to the situation in Central America denounced, in paragraph 136 of the Political Declaration [*see S/15675 and Corr.1 and 2, annex*]:

> "the new and increasing threats and acts of intimidation and the growing seriousness and increased number of acts of aggression against Nicaragua, particularly the violation of its airspace and territorial waters, the utilization of the territory of foreign countries in and outside the region as bases for aggression and the training of counter-revolutionary forces, the commission of terrorist actions and sabotage, particularly the attacks of armed groups of ex-Somoza guards through its northern border, which had resulted in considerable loss of life and property, as well as measures of economic pressure at the international level. These were considered part of a deliberate plan to harass and destabilize that country, as has been acknowledged by a foreign Power."

12. The heads of State or Government also called on the Governments of the United States and Honduras to adopt a constructive position in favour of peace and dialogue, in conformity with the principles of international law, and called on all States to avoid any act of policy that might increase tensions in the region.

13. In relations between States, the principles of international law must be inviolate and scrupulously respected. That is our only guarantee of peaceful and stable inter-State relations. The international community long ago outlawed intervention as an instrument of State behaviour. More recently, in 1970, the General Assembly adopted the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.[1] That Declaration, taking the Charter as its point of departure, solemnly proclaimed, *inter alia*, the principle that States shall refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations. The Declaration on Friendly Relations also set forth the principle that States shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security are not endangered.

14. In December 1981, the General Assembly adopted the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention

READEX FICHE

and Interference in the Internal Affairs of States.[2] The Declaration set out in clear language the duties comprehended in the principle of non-intervention and non-interference. Those duties include:

> "(*a*) The duty of States to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force in any form whatsoever to violate the existing internationally recognized boundaries of another State, to disrupt the political, social or economic order of other States, to overthrow or change the political system of another State or its Government, to cause tension between or among States or to deprive peoples of their national identity and cultural heritage;
>
> "(*b*) The duty of a State to ensure that its territory is not used in any manner which would violate the sovereignty, political independence, territorial integrity and national unity or disrupt the political, economic and social stability of another State; . . .
>
> "(*c*) The duty of a State to refrain from armed intervention, subversion, military occupation or any other form of intervention and interference, overt or covert, directed at another State or group of States, or any act of military, political or economic interference in the internal affairs of another State, including acts of reprisal involving the use of force;
>
> ". . .
>
> "(*e*) The duty of a State to refrain from any action or attempt in whatever form or under whatever pretext to destabilize or to undermine the stability of another State or of any of its institutions".[3]

This Declaration enjoys the total support of the members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, because its principles have historically been a corner-stone of our Movement. We felt it was necessary to set them out in clear, declaratory form as further protection for small States, which are invariably the victims of aggression and intervention.

15. It must be emphasized here again that the people of Nicaragua are striving for nothing more than their political, economic and social advancement. Their efforts are not aimed at proving or disproving the superiority of one ideological world view or another. It is dangerous, unrealistic and self-serving to seek to distort and misrepresent the domestic impulses for change in Central America and to seek to explain them in terms of an East-West confrontation.

16. The infiltration of counter-revolutionary forces into Nicaragua, in addition to constituting an attack against the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of that State, is causing great loss of life and damage to property and is diverting the efforts of the Nicaraguan Government from its most important task of nation-building. What is more, this action leads to a heightening of the tension in the relations between Honduras and Nicaragua, with the increased danger of an armed conflict which could engulf the entire subregion, with dangerous consequences for the peace and security of the Americas and the Caribbean.

17. The grave nature of the present situation notwithstanding, my delegation nourishes the hope that there is still a chance for reason to prevail and for the voices of moderation to be heard over the shrill clamour of intervention and belligerence. My delegation makes a solemn appeal for an end to all aggressive actions and attitudes towards Nicaragua and the Sandinist revolution. We appeal for full respect for the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Nicaragua. We appeal for peace to be given a chance in Central America.

18. In this context, Guyana would like to express its appreciation and support for the efforts of States in the region to find peaceful solutions to the crises prevailing in Central America. We make special mention of the proposals of the Governments of Colombia, Mexico, Panama and Venezuela[4] articulated earlier this year in the Panamanian island of Contadora. Guyana expresses its positive encouragement of this initiative.

19. My delegation also welcomes the reiteration by the Government of Nicaragua of its willingness to enter into a dialogue on Central American problems, its readiness to tackle immediately the problems and differences which have resulted from military actions in its border area with Honduras and its open, constructive attitude to the peaceful settlement of the crises in Central America. My delegation urges all States, in the interest of the well-being of the Nicaraguan people and of peace and stability in Central America, to abandon postures of intervention and destabilization and instead to seek political solutions to whatever differences may exist between them and Nicaragua. I also wish here to reiterate Guyana's unswerving solidarity with the Government and people of Nicaragua in their struggle to defend their independence, their sovereignty and their territorial integrity.

20. Mr. SHAH NAWAZ (Pakistan): It gives me special pleasure, Sir, to join my colleagues who have spoken before me to extend our congratulations on your assumption of the office of President of the Security Council and to express our appreciation for the exemplary manner in which you have conducted the deliberations of the Council during the past three weeks. We feel confident that the Council will continue to benefit from your wide experience, ability and diplomatic skill in the consideration of the issues before it. May I also take this opportunity to express our appreciation of the excellent manner in which your predecessor, Mr. Troyanovsky, the representative of the Soviet Union, conducted the proceedings of the Council last month.

21. The fact is not disputed that the situation in Central America remains deeply disturbed. The growing dislocation of political, social and economic life in that region, resulting from ideological confrontations and foreign interference, is a cause of profound concern and deep

anxiety to all of us who profess our commitment to the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations. The worsening situation in the Central American region is of immediate concern to the Security Council, which, under the Charter, has the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security.

22. We have listened with close attention to the statements made by the representatives of the countries directly involved and also to statements by others deeply interested in the situation. The factual situation in the region may look somewhat blurred, but not totally obfuscated, in the light of the passionately held views of the protagonists. There is no doubt that the situation on the Nicaraguan border with Honduras has greatly worsened in recent days and threatens to develop into an armed conflict between these two States, the consequences of which are bound to extend beyond their territories.

23. The process of change in developing countries in recent times is a familiar phenomenon. It is also a familiar development that outside interested parties have sought to distort or thwart this process in the pursuit of goals and objectives which have nothing to do with the interests and aspirations of the peoples directly involved in the process of change. It is as much a travesty to present foreign armed intervention in the affairs of other States as an internal uprising as it is to describe a genuine liberation struggle as a manifestation of foreign interference.

24. It is the sovereign right of all free peoples to decide their own form of government and the political, social and economic structures best suited to their genius free from foreign intervention and to shape their destiny in accordance with their own free will. It is also vital for the peace and security of all States that the process of change within a country not be exploited by any other country for its own purposes, nor should any other country seek to prescribe that process as an unsolicited panacea for the problems of other countries. It is not permissible for any outside Power to attempt to capture the process of change with a view to predetermining its course or changing its direction in its own interest.

25. The people of Nicaragua courageously overthrew the oppressive Somoza régime and are poised to pluck the fruits of their revolutionary struggle. They deserve our help and support to complete the process of change in peace and to consolidate the foundations of a better life for their present and future generations. They have a difficult road to traverse, and it will take time before they achieve total harmony and the fulfilment of their hopes and aspirations. They can do so in peace and with a sense of responsibility if they do not feel threatened by external aggression.

26. During our visit to Nicaragua on the occasion of the Extraordinary Ministerial Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Countries, held at Managua from 10 to 14 January 1983, we had the opportunity to meet the leaders and people of the country and to witness their efforts to rebuild their homeland, so recently ravaged by internal strife and natural calamity. We wish them well and we feel confident that, left alone, they will be able to achieve their objectives without causing anxiety or concern to any of their neighbours.

27. Pakistan is deeply interested in the demonstration of respect for the principles of the Charter by all concerned in the Central American region, even though we are situated at a distance from that region. Our experience in our own region convinces us that unquestionably the Charter principles are of universal applicability and that no State can escape the consequences of the violation of those principles, no matter how distant the region in which they occur.

28. It is highly satisfying that the representatives of Nicaragua and Honduras have both expressed a desire on the part of their Governments to engage in a dialogue in order to seek a negotiated settlement of their differences. In this context, we welcome the initiatives taken by the regional States, which can effectively contribute towards the reduction of tensions and the settlement of the disputes between the neighbouring States. The Council has a great opportunity to encourage such initiatives for peace. It should also take an active interest in promoting a process of peaceful negotiation in fulfilment of its responsibilities under the Charter. As a first step, it might consider sending a fact-finding mission to the region to assess the situation on the ground and to report its findings to the Council. The dispatch of such a fact-finding mission would in itself serve to reduce tension and would be in conformity with the recommendation in the Secretary-General's report on the work of the Organization to the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly.[5]

29. Mr. OVINNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): Permit me first of all, Sir, to congratulate you, no longer merely upon the assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month but also in connection with the fact that, for almost a month now, you have successfully and effectively been discharging these functions. Permit me also to thank those delegations that have complimented the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Mr. Troyanovsky, on the discharge by him of his functions as President of the Security Council last month.

30. At the request of the Government of Nicaragua, the Council has been urgently convened to consider the question of the expansion of acts of aggression against that State.

31. The Soviet delegation has listened attentively to the cogent statement of the Deputy Minister for External Relations of Nicaragua, Mr. Victor Hugo Tinoco. He made a broad and well-developed case confirming the justness of the appeal by the Government of Nicaragua to the Security Council. The numerous facts contained in that statement incontrovertibly demonstrate that direct armed intervention is being waged against the Republic of Nicaragua from the territory of neighbouring Honduras, and that the United States is the prime mover behind

that intervention. Accordingly, there has arisen in that area an extremely serious situation which poses a direct threat to international peace and security.

32. There can be no doubt that the incursion into Nicaragua of gangs of counter-revolutionary mercenaries is the most recent act in an undeclared but none the less dangerous war which the United States has for some years now been waging against the Nicaraguan people and its revolution.

33. The Republic of Nicaragua is appealing to the Council and bringing to it a complaint against actions of the United States by no means for the first time. These actions of the United States have created a threat to Nicaragua's sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence. Precisely one year ago [*2335th to 2337th, 2339th, 2341st to 2343rd and 2347th meetings*] this question was the subject of careful consideration by the Council. At that time the United States blocked the adoption by the Council of a draft resolution [*S/14941*] designed to bring about a peaceful settlement of the problems of Central America, a draft resolution that condemned intervention in the internal affairs of the States of that region and called for a renunciation of the threat or use of force. In retrospect it has become exceedingly clear that the United States veto of that Security Council draft resolution last year was by no means an accident. The United States was thus reserving its right to have recourse to armed force in the struggle against the Nicaraguan revolution.

34. The current invasion of Nicaragua by the Somozist mercenaries, prepared and instigated by the United States, is the direct continuation and consequence of this United States policy. From the political standpoint the United States has unleashed against Nicaragua a low and base slanderous campaign in which the highest ranks of the American Administration are involved. Militarily speaking, on United States territory, particularly in Miami, but also in Texas and in California, bases have been set up for the military training of Nicaraguan counter-revolutionaries. Similar camps have been set up in Honduras, where former Somozists are being armed, trained and equipped through the use of Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) funds. Today—and here lies the particular danger of this new stage—these mercenaries trained and nurtured by the United States have been released from their chains and thrown against the Nicaraguan people.

35. It is instructive to note that in her statement to the Council [*2420th meeting*] the United States representative was entirely silent about these facts. She did not deny them. In that statement the representative of the United States even attempted to wax ironical at the allegedly unjustified "obsession" of the Nicaraguans with the danger of invasion by the United States. If we are to believe her assertions, what is happening in Nicaragua is nothing more than a matter of internal complications.

36. However, we should like to draw particular attention to one ominous circumstance. This manoeuvre of American diplomacy in the United Nations is not new. As recent history has shown, such movement is a prelude to large-scale intervention. By means of precisely such verbal cover Washington prepared an intervention in 1954 against Guatemala and another in 1961 against Cuba. It is worth dwelling on this in further detail.

37. Almost 30 years ago Washington embarked on a slander campaign against the progressive régime in Guatemala. Formerly secret material of the White House and the State Department that has since been published makes irrefutably clear the hypocrisy and cynicism of this diversionary operation. Under cover of it—as emerges clearly from these documents; I stress "documents"—the United States organized and trained interventionist forces for use against Guatemala, primarily on the territory of Honduras. By way of a direct pretext for intervention, as it were, to lend verisimilitude, the CIA even at that time organized bombings of the aerodrome in Honduras. At the same time the CIA introduced into Guatemala itself a number of radio stations which were represented as being "rebel" radio stations. How reminiscent of this is the style of today's American operation against Nicaragua. The same leading figures are involved—counter-revolutionaries armed from abroad, from the United States and Honduras.

38. I should, however, like to add that immediately after the conclusion of the 1954 *coup* in Guatemala the United States Ambassador to that country, Mr. Puerifoy, presented to the new authorities an extremely cynical document. It was a list of names of Guatemalan citizens who were to be shot within 24 hours at the request of the United States Ambassador—I repeat, at the request of the United States Ambassador. Here you have the true position of United States diplomacy in the matter of human rights, a position that is now a matter of historical record. After that one may ask what value we are to attach to the homily delivered the day before yesterday in the Council by the United States representative regarding what was described as the concern of the United States about human rights in Nicaragua.

39. Finally, there is the cynical outcome of the United States operation against Guatemala in 1954, intended to stifle the progressive régime there. The chief of the mercenaries who had been instructed to carry out the *coup* by the CIA, Castillo Armas, stated at the time to the then Vice President of the United States, Mr. Nixon: "Tell us what you want us to do, and that is what we will do." Those words were uttered in fact after the mass executions carried out on the basis of the lists delivered by the United States Ambassador.

40. These facts are incontrovertible, and I am basing all that I say on United States documents that reveal the true face of United States policy in Latin America.

41. I would like to mention one further interventionist operation by the United States, one that failed. That is the operation against Cuba in 1961. The United States President, as far back as March of 1960, had ordered the CIA to prepare that intervention; this is a fact that has

now been fully documented. The representatives of the United States in the United Nations were at the time busy slandering Cuba. The United States was already organizing and arranging the financing and training of mercenaries against Cuba on Guatemalan territory, while Washington's diplomats were still holding forth on the "Red threat". Is it not one of the bitter ironies of history that this time preparations for intervention against the progressive régime in Cuba were carried out on Guatemalan territory, where the United States had earlier overthrown another progressive régime? That is the real "domino theory"—counting upon overthrowing progressive régimes one after the other. And United States practice is in accordance with it.

42. Finally, the invasion of Cuba by mercenaries in April 1961 was also begun under cover of the pretext of the alleged beginning of an "internal uprising" inside Cuba. Washington, for example, declared that Cuban airports were being bombed by Cuban pilots who were supposedly "disillusioned with the régime". The then United States representative to the United Nations—and many will have a personal memory of this—displayed to representatives photographs of those aircraft bearing the identification markings of the Cuban armed forces. All of this, as we know today, was the crudest of counterfeits. The aircraft, the pilots, the bombs and even the photographs themselves were all the work of the CIA.

43. After all this, after such a record of service in Latin America by Washington, the United States representative is still trying to discredit the fears of Nicaragua. Now, however, we know. This may very well be another cover operation, and particularly because the United States representative has made no secret here of her hatred of the Sandinists.

44. Thus recent history and actions of the United States in Latin America have shown that it is not a matter of Nicaragua's misguidedly and wrongly fearing intervention on the part of the United States. The fact is that the United States has been suffering to a dangerous degree from a disease called "power mania", a mania of disrespect for the freedom and independence of Latin American countries, an intervention mania. In the final analysis, the so-called "big stick" policy is an invention of the United States linguistically, politically and militarily to be a means of resolving the problem of human rights.

45. If today the United States is openly arming and training former Somozists and sending them onto Nicaraguan territory, the prime motive here is simply to overthrow a progressive national régime in that country and set up a puppet, pro-American régime. It would appear that there are some in Washington who lose sleep at the thought of how obedient a tool the dictator Somoza was in their hands. It is known that Somoza once cynically told the President of Mexico, Luis Echeverría, literally the following: "You should envy me. I have no problems. All I have to do is what Washington wants me to do."

46. The architects of this kind of United States policy, however, should have understood long ago that the days of Somoza, Batista and Trujillo have disappeared into oblivion for ever. Neither the support of anti-popular dictatorial régimes nor intervention on the part of mercenaries will be able to prevent the peoples themselves from determining their own fate, nor will they succeed in breaking the people of Nicaragua.

47. At a meeting held today in Moscow with the Coordinator of the Governing Junta of National Reconstruction of Nicaragua, Mr. Daniel Ortega Saavedra, the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Mr. Andropov, stated the sincere solidarity of the Soviet Union with the Nicaraguan people and expressed his conviction that Nicaragua will succeed in defending its freedom and independence.

48. The Soviet delegation vigorously condemns the intervention against Nicaragua prepared and carried out by the United States and its mercenaries. It supports the appeal contained in the statement made by the representative of Nicaragua to the Council [*ibid.*] to call on the United States to put an end to acts of provocation against Nicaragua and to halt the undeclared war being waged against that country by the United States Administration.

49. However, what makes the current phase of the interventionist activity of the United States particularly dangerous now is the fact that we are not talking here about an isolated operation against Nicaragua.

50. The aggressive interventionist policy of the United States against Nicaragua is part of its overall policy of stepping up international tension and escalating threats to independent States in various parts of the world. These actions are aimed directly at all non-aligned and other developing countries which are pursuing an independent foreign and domestic policy and do not wish to follow in the wake of Washington.

51. Just a month ago the United States had recourse to flagrant acts of armed provocation and military pressure against Libya. Today it has raised to a new stage intervention against Nicaragua. Tomorrow the target of American blackmail could be any other non-aligned State whose policy is not to Washington's liking.

52. That is why now that Nicaragua is calling upon fraternal non-aligned countries and other States Members of the United Nations for support in this hour of trial for that small country, it is the duty of all countries which love peace and freedom to give Nicaragua that support.

53. Mr. SALAH (Jordan) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The delegation of Jordan is primarily concerned at the tension existing inside and around Nicaragua's borders and in the Central American region. Our concern is due to three main factors.

54. First, the last thing needed by Nicaragua and certain Central American countries affected by the present crisis is tension characterized by fear and the danger of armed conflict. The first thing the people of that region need is stability and tranquillity so that they can concentrate all their efforts and means on development and construction. Exhausting their means in a conflict would hardly bring the kind of prosperity that the people of good will of that region so ardently desire.

55. Secondly, it must be realized that security cannot be realized by force. That would be a vain policy. That policy has been and is being tested by one of the parties in conflict in the Middle East, but the results of such conduct are obvious to all: there has been an increase in tension, an excess of violence and a lessening of the chances for peace and security. Furthermore—and this increases our concern—the party in question is becoming involved in the affairs of the region that is under consideration; that party is intensifying its various policies in the region and taking advantage of certain social contradictions and the economic gaps that exist.

56. That type of sabotage in the region confirms what we have said on a number of occasions about our concern. The country in question is pursuing an expansionist policy against Arab countries too and is intervening in the internal affairs of others. This has disturbed the international atmosphere, accentuated tension and caused much turmoil in international affairs. The persistent attempts of that State to control that part of the world and use it as a theatre for its plans require that the international community act with caution in view of the dangers inherent in that policy.

57. The enormous arms transactions and the sending of military experts to that part of the world will certainly not help to consolidate peace and security among the peoples there. We believe that security and war are in a sense inversely proportionate.

58. Thirdly, what accentuates our concern is how frequently there has been recourse to violence and force in international affairs, and insufficient attention has been given to the effects of that negative policy internally and externally. Also, there has been a failure to recognize the results of intervention in the internal affairs of others and the need for good-neighbourliness among States.

59. I have referred to the Middle East in my statement about Central America, not only to point out that those at the source of tension in our region play a role in complicating the problems of our brothers in Central America, but also to recall the consequences of these policies for security and stability not only on the internal affairs of the countries in question but at the regional and international levels as well.

60. The likelihood of the conflict spreading beyond the bilateral or regional framework and becoming internationalized has accentuated our concern; that could very dangerously polarize affairs, resulting in greater hardship and more suffering for the people in that friendly region. Such a situation would lead to more serious and more widespread problems, and that would mean ignoring the main disputes in order to deal with the emerging problems. Our region also has suffered from such a state of affairs. We see a feverish attempt being made to disguise the true source of tension by creating new problems as a result of war and expansion.

61. Countries must avoid cold war policies, they must promote détente, and they must cease using small States to test and implement their policies. We feel that the major Powers, which bear a special responsibility vis-*à-vis* security and stability throughout the world, have a better course to follow, instead of pursuing the unacceptable interventionist policy or being indifferent. They must stand by the small countries. They must help them build their democratic and modern institutions and help them develop their productive potential so that they, too, can exercise self-determination without foreign interference. All that would certainly help all the parties to create an atmosphere, regionally and internationally, full of understanding, co-operation and mutual respect.

62. To believe that "He who is not with me is against me" is wrong policy. It ignores the principle of non-alignment, which is followed by more than two thirds of the countries of the world, including Nicaragua, whose people have suffered for more than half a century from one-man dictatorship and who now, more than ever before, need security and peace so that they can devote themselves to security and development. That, if achieved, would be the main guarantee for human rights and would ensure a life of dignity for the citizens of the country.

63. I should like to appeal to all the parties concerned, an appeal that has been repeated by many of those who have spoken before me, to follow a policy of self-control, avoid escalation and settle disputes peacefully by means of a constructive dialogue and quiet diplomacy. We have been encouraged by the declarations of the representatives of all parties concerned in which they expressed their countries' readiness to continue a policy of dialogue and negotiations in an effort to agree on a friendly settlement of the existing dispute. We also hope that efforts made by leaders of States in the area, in particular those of the Presidents of Mexico and Venezuela, will be continued, to bring viewpoints together and to arrive at a common denominator. We believe that if confidence and co-operation prevail, if everyone shows patience and calm, then a spirit of moderation and understanding will prevail and the reasons for tension will disappear.

64. In conclusion I should like to recall what may be known to all, that is, that violence has never succeeded in solving any problem.

65. Mr. LOUET (France) (*interpretation from French*): I should like to say how pleased my delegation is at seeing the representative of a country so close to ours presiding since the beginning of this month over the

Security Council. Our work has been particularly heavy, and under your enlightened direction, Sir, we have been able to make progress.

66. I should like also to pay a tribute to the representative of the Soviet Union, who presided with such wisdom over our work last month.

67. My delegation has listened with the closest attention to the representatives of Nicaragua, Honduras and the United States. We listened also with particular interest to the representative of Mexico, who made a remarkable speech, as well as to the statements of representatives of Colombia, Ecuador, Costa Rica and Spain.

68. We had already met a year ago [*2335th meeting*] to hear Nicaragua's statement about threats to its security. Today that same country is complaining once again at having to face an armed struggle that imperils its stability. Quite clearly the problems have not been solved and the letter sent to you by Nicaragua, Sir, demonstrates the deterioration of the situation in Central America.

69. Very much concerned by this rising tension, the French Government appeals for moderation. It rejects recourse to force and would like to see the establishment of a climate of understanding, which would make it possible to resolve all the problems of the region by dialogue and negotiation.

70. In this regard we welcome the initiative put forward last year by Mexico and Venezuela to find a solution to the problem of the conflict between Honduras and Nicaragua, and we regret that this initiative was not followed up. We also welcome last January's Contadora declaration,[4] and we support its principles, in particular its condemnation of interference in Latin American disputes and its refusal to situate these disputes within the framework of the East-West confrontation. This declaration is in any case in no way in contradiction with the Honduran peace plan of March 1982 [*S/14919, annex*], in which, at the time, we stressed our interest.

71. Dialogue can start only in the absence of external interference. Anxious to see Central America recovering the calm and stability necessary to strengthen democracy and respect for human rights, France rejects any interference, whatever its source. France is convinced that the countries of the region can find, through dialogue and concerted endeavour, ways and means of restoring peace.

72. Mr. TINOCO (Nicaragua) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Nicaragua wanted to speak to present some information and to bring the situation up to date somewhat as it continues to develop. It is a tense situation in the border region between Nicaragua and Honduras. We hope that we will be constructive.

73. About an hour ago we submitted a letter [*S/15656*] to you, Sir, in your capacity as President of the Security Council, in which the delegation of Nicaragua presents a number of official documents from our Government giving information about the situation in the border area. These documents have been annexed to the letter, and we understand they may be available in a few hours to the members of the Council.

74. The annexes are the following. Annex I is a message from the Governing Junta of National Reconstruction dated 21 March 1983, to which I referred last Wednesday in my introductory statement [*2420th meeting*]. Annex II is a note of protest sent to Mr. Edgardo Paz Barnica, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Honduras, by Mrs. Nora Astorga, Acting Minister for External Relations of Nicaragua, referring to a certain border incident which I also mentioned in my introductory statement. This has to do with certain attacks from Honduran territory by the Honduran army against a Nicaraguan military observation post. The third annex is an official communiqué from the Ministry of Defence of Nicaragua about another incident. Annex IV is the text of another note of protest sent to Mr. Paz Barnica by Mrs. Astorga, dated 24 March. I should like to read a portion of it aloud to bring members of the Council up to date and to go a little further into the situation as it exists at present in Central America.

> "The purpose of this note is to bring the following to your attention:
>
> "At 8:10 a.m. today, 24 March 1983, troops of the Honduran army opened fire from their positions in Honduran territory on the Nicaraguan armed forces' observation post on La Zopilota hill, 2 kilometres south-west of San Pedro de Potrero Grande, department of Chinandega. The attack, in which gunfire from various types of weapons was used, lasted 15 minutes.
>
> "Later that day at noon, another Honduran military unit made an attack with gunfire on a patrol of the Sandinist People's Army at a place called El Oyate, 6 kilometres north-west of the frontier post at El Espino, department of Madriz, wounding one member of the Nicaraguan patrol.
>
> "Moreover, at 9:30 a.m. yesterday, 23 March, troops of the Sandinist People's Army intercepted a unit of Somoza counter-revolutionaries who were attempting to infiltrate into Nicaraguan territory from Honduran territory. As a result of this engagement, three of our soldiers were killed, and 15 FAL automatic rifles, one RPG-7 rocket launcher . . . and several kilograms of C-4 plastic explosives were seized from the counter-revolutionaries."

That is the main information contained in the diplomatic note sent by Mrs. Astorga to Mr. Paz Barnica regarding these border incidents. There are a number of political considerations following upon the above text, but I need not go into them because these matters have already in one way or another been pointed out in this chamber. Annex V is the text of a note of protest sent to Mr. Paz

Barnica by Mrs. Astorga, also dated 24 March. The text of that note reads as follows:

[*The speaker read annex V to document S/15656.*]

75. I wanted to introduce and read out these documents, which will be in the hands of Council members in a few hours, precisely to emphasize the fact that the existing conflict in the border region between Nicaragua and Honduras has taken a dangerous turn, that is, towards the possibility of an internationalization of the conflict, which, as we said last Wednesday, could be part of a more comprehensive plan to attempt to overthrow the revolutionary Government of Nicaragua.

76. In contrast to this official information which I have just transmitted to the Council and which reflects the seriousness of the border situation with Honduras, the attacks that are occurring and the danger of escalation of this conflict, I should like to read out a very small part of an article which most Council members have probably already read, it having been published in today's edition of *The New York Times*. It was written by the well-known American correspondent and specialist in Latin American affairs, Mr. Alan Riding, who is now in Managua. One of the most important parts of this background article by this writer well known in the United States is as follows. Referring to a press conference by the Interior Minister of Nicaragua, Commander Tomás Borge, Mr. Riding wrote:

> "Mr. Borge estimated that some 2,000 'counter-revolutionaries' were now inside Nicaragua. But he said most were operating in the northern provinces of Nueva Segovia, Jinotega and Zelaya, which border on Honduras.
>
> " 'Matagalpa is merely diversionary to make us lower our guard in the north', he declared.
>
> "The news conference was held as the situation in the country as a whole appeared calm. Travelers to Matagalpa Province found that roads were open to ordinary traffic and that none of the towns claimed to be controlled by rebels—San Ramón, Muy Muy, Matiguás or San Dionisio—had even been attacked. Army patrols, though, had apparently been stepped up in the area."*

77. I wanted to read out some of this article from an American source well versed in the region precisely to contrast this with other reports and point out that the facts tend to confirm the fears expressed by Nicaragua last Wednesday that the Somozist counter-revolutionary forces infiltrated inside Nicaragua do not in themselves represent a military threat for the stability of revolutionary power, but that they could play a co-operating role as part of broader aggressive action against Nicaragua whose goal would be to strike militarily against Nicaragua in the Pacific region or other regions, with the participation of other forces in the area that are not only Somozist forces. That is to say that, on the one hand, the falsity of the information and propaganda about the counter-revolutionary forces and their control or activities inside the country has been clearly confirmed; on the other hand, it has been reaffirmed that the counter-revolutionary activity is mostly in the border area, where, as we said, the majority of the counter-revolutionary troops are located and precisely where the incidents with some Honduran military units are taking place. In conclusion, the facts tend to confirm our fears that, because of forces outside the region, the conflict is being converted into an international conflict which will have a destabilizing influence and create even greater problems for the Sandinist revolution.

78. I should also like to present some specific facts concerning the information that has been referred to by delegations that have already spoken in this forum in relation to events and talks that should be taking place in Central America.

79. My delegation wishes to repeat that it considers it vital and urgent to continue to take up bilateral problems between Honduras and Nicaragua, precisely in order to prevent the escalation of a bilateral conflict. Therefore we repeat that we are ready and willing to revitalize the Mexican-Venezuelan proposal, which calls for negotiations and dialogue between Honduras and Nicaragua in the presence of the initiative's two sponsor countries. We repeat Nicaragua's willingness to go further into these bilateral negotiations that we regard as fundamental, and we call on the initiative's sponsor Governments to approach the parties involved in the conflict to sound them out and see if they are prepared for dialogue.

80. The delegation of Nicaragua also wishes to stress that our country is willing to move forward in consideration of the regional problem in Central America. We repeat that we are prepared to listen to initiatives from the sponsor countries of the Contadora initiative[4]—the Governments of Colombia, Mexico, Panama and Venezuela—in order to begin those steps that can lead us to serious and profound consideration of the Central American crisis, its origins, its factors, its worsening, those responsible for it and the steps to be taken to resolve it. We insist therefore that, as we move along bilaterally, we begin to tackle the more complex problems of the regional crisis.

81. But what we do not accept—and what we regard as very dangerous—is that the urgency of bilateral dialogue aimed at resolving urgent problems, such as the threat of an international war, should be denied under the pretext that efforts are being made at the regional level to find solutions for the region. Solutions to the region's problems must be found because that is the only way to spare the people of Nicaragua and the people of Central America further hardship. A regional solution must be sought step by step, as the problem is exceedingly delicate.

* Quoted in English by the speaker.

82. Of course we shall talk about an arms buildup; of course we shall talk about advisers; of course we shall talk about significant factors and incidents in the crisis in the region; of course we shall talk about an excessive arms buildup. However, in order to define something as excessive we must define the threat that is facing us, and before qualifying a country's arms buildup as excessive we must qualify the threat hanging over that country, the determining factors, the political will of the Governments inside and outside the region that are involved in this conflict and the readiness of the countries hostile to the country being accused of an excessive arms buildup to respect territorial integrity and sovereignty and publicly to commit themselves not to commit aggression against that country.

83. Therefore Nicaragua repeats that it is prepared to move forward on the regional level in a serious and sustained manner. But in order to prevent internationalization of the war, it urges the taking of steps to deal bilaterally with the problems between Honduras and Nicaragua and halt the campaign of aggression against Nicaragua that is being waged across our borders and against our people.

84. At the same time, the delegation of Nicaragua wishes to stress that it is prepared to consider any other specific suggestion that the Council believes should be considered or explored, in the Council or by any other means. The delegation of Nicaragua has an open mind in this respect; our interest in convening this meeting was to call attention to the seriousness of the situation, and for this reason we are prepared to examine any means of finding a solution.

85. In conclusion, we believe it important to refer to another matter, in connection with the position of the Government of the United States. We should recall that the President of the United States has, to all intents and purposes, repeated the accusations of an arms buildup by Nicaragua in his press conference of two days ago, which we are all familiar with. In order to accuse us of an arms buildup he showed a satellite photograph of Augusto César Sandino International Airport, where there were three Soviet-made MI-8 helicopters for civilian use. One of those helicopters is the one the Pope used to go to León on his recent visit. What are they trying to prove by showing a photograph of Augusto César Sandino International Airport with three helicopters that cannot even fly as far as Miami or any other place in the United States?

86. The general view seems to be that President Reagan, by presenting a series of misinterpreted facts, simply wanted to justify an increase in the military budget he is requesting at home. That is one view that has been widely disseminated. However, for those countries that are being singled out, there could be an explanation other than the mere domestic use of this accusation for reasons concerned with the military budget, and that is that the political conditions are being prepared for acts of aggression against those countries. We cannot be so irresponsible as to believe naïvely that arguments are being put forward just to increase the military budget of the United States.

87. As the representative of Grenada said yesterday [*2422nd meeting*], the history of the United States in Latin America has shown clearly that the aggressive acts of the United States against Latin American countries have been preceded by such political publicity campaigns to prepare American public opinion to accept this kind of military involvement in the region. Thus we should like also to express our concern over these references which not only are baseless and devoid of material content but constitute a threat to our country.

88. In addition, and still in this connection, we wish to point out that we continue to be concerned at the lack of response to our specific charges in respect of the involvement of the Government of the United States in the destabilization efforts against Nicaragua. There has been a silence, and that has been pointed out by a number of representatives in this chamber. Will the silence continue? Will the delegation of the United States continue to remain silent, and in its silence will it reaffirm that a Government which is not democratic, according to the values, canons and interests of the empire, should be overthrown and that it is thus proper to destabilize such a Government and to do what is now practically being publicly accepted?

89. I have three concrete questions that need replies. First, is the delegation of the United States here publicly going to deny that there are links between the CIA and counter-revolutionary bands that have infiltrated Nicaragua? Secondly, is the delegation of the United States going to deny that it is giving money and that there exists an official economic budget for the promotion and support of the counter-revolutionary bands that are taking action against Nicaragua? Thirdly, is the delegation of the United States going to deny officially the existence of training camps for Somozist counter-revolutionaries on United States territory?

90. Mrs. KIRKPATRICK (United States of America): We do not live or act, as Jacob Burckhardt observed, for ourselves alone, but for the past and the future as well. What happens here in the Security Council reflects the expectations and hopes of those who framed this institution and defines as well the hopes and expectations that may be reasonably attached to it for the future. It is at best ironic that the interactions of the past days should have coincided with the Council's ongoing discussion of the Secretary-General's report on the work of the Organization.[6]

91. We have witnessed in the so-called consideration of the Nicaraguan complaint the kind of cynical debasement of the process of conflict resolution which underlies and largely explains the various specific failures that are outlined in the Secretary-General's report.

92. Nicaragua's new dictators—who share their mentor's preference for wearing military uniforms, carrying

weapons and calling each other by military titles—have come to the Council seeking international support for their policy of internal repression and external aggression. They appeal to the Council to guarantee their right to continue these policies without fear of opposition from other Nicaraguans who, finding all means of peaceful political competition closed to them, seek to open their political system and reclaim their society from the strangulation of totalitarian controls and foreign exploitation. For let us be clear that Nicaragua has closed its political system and that Nicaragua does engage ever more openly in aggression against its neighbours.

93. I spoke earlier about the systematic effort of Nicaragua to consolidate totalitarian control over Nicaraguan society, about the silencing of criticism, the destruction of indigenous societies filled with people who ask only to be left alone, about the use of "divine mobs" to intimidate opposition and about the crude attacks on the Catholic and other churches, extending even to the Pope himself. I did not mention yesterday that this repression is carried out by a new secret police apparatus—the Sandinist State Security—whose thousands of recruits have been trained by Cuban professionals in the suppression of internal dissent. Thus do fraternal "socialist" societies of the totalitarian variant assist one another. Nicaragua's new dictators not only receive help; they also offer fraternal assistance to armed guerrillas seeking to overthrow the Governments of neighbouring States.

94. Indeed, the representatives of Nicaragua no longer even bother to deny that they train and export guerrillas and arms to and through neighbouring countries, though it has not been long since they answered with wide-eyed lies evidence of their many activities aimed at the destruction of the economies and the overthrow of the Governments of El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras and other neighbouring States.

95. Between them, Cuba and Nicaragua have managed enough fraternal help to the guerrillas of the region to bring to a halt the economic development that was steadily improving life and prospects in the area, to sow death and destruction in El Salvador and to reap insecurity in Honduras, Costa Rica and elsewhere in the region.

96. Examples abound of the systematic creation and support by Cuba and Nicaragua of war against the other Central American States. In December 1981, after meetings at Havana with Salvadoran guerrilla leaders, Fidel Castro directed that external supplies of arms to El Salvador's units of the Farabundo Martí National Liberation Front (FMLN) be stepped up to make possible an offensive to disrupt any chance for a peaceful vote in El Salvador's March 1982 elections.

97. In addition to vitally needed ammunition, these supply operations included greater quantities of more sophisticated, heavier weapons. Deliveries in 1982 included M-60 machine-guns, M-79 grenade launchers and M-72 antitank weapons, thus significantly increasing guerrilla fire-power. Individual units also regularly received tens of thousands of dollars for routine purchases of non-lethal supplies on commercial markets and for payments, including bribes, to enable the clandestine munitions pipeline to function.

98. Following the set-back caused by their overwhelming repudiation in El Salvador's elections, the FMLN leaders repeated what they had done following their 1981 failed final offensive, this time with still more help.

99. After two years of combat, the FMLN headquarters in Nicaragua has evolved into an extremely sophisticated command and control centre. Guerrilla planning and operations in El Salvador are guided from this headquarters by Cuban and Nicaraguan officers. FMLN headquarters co-ordinates logistical support for guerrilla units widely spread throughout El Salvador, including food, medicines, clothing, money and—most important—weapons and ammunition.

100. On 14 March 1982, the FMLN clandestine radio, "Venceremos", then located in El Salvador, broadcast a message to the guerrillas in El Salvador urging them "to maintain their fighting spirit 24 hours a day to carry out the missions ordered by the FMLN general command"—in Nicaragua, that is.

101. Thus, the Nicaraguans provide the arms and weapons to destroy their neighbour's economy, and they direct the effort from their territory. But their activities are not restricted to El Salvador. They also seek to subvert their democratic neighbours Honduras and Costa Rica, while using their territories as intermediate points to channel and disguise outside support for the Salvadoran guerrillas. In Honduras, Nicaraguan agents and Salvadoran extreme leftist groups have maintained links with almost all the Honduran terrorist groups to assist them in subversive planning, training and operations. They have played a role in the increased terrorism in Honduras. Discussions were held in mid-1982 among the Cubans, Sandinists and Salvadoran insurgents about steps to take against the Honduran Government. Captured Salvadoran and Honduran terrorists have admitted that explosives used in bombing attacks in the Honduran capital were obtained in Nicaragua. Other information indicates the Cubans had a hand in planning the seizure of 108 hostages in San Pedro Sula in September 1982.

102. The Morazanist National Liberation Front of Honduras was described in the pro-Government Nicaraguan newspaper *El Nuevo Diario* by "Octavio", one of its founders, as a political-military organization formed as part of the "increasing regionalization of the Central American conflict". As a result of a raid on 27 November 1981 the Honduran police ultimately captured several members of this group. The captured terrorists told Honduran authorities that the Nicaraguan Government had provided them with funds for travel expenses as well as explosives. Captured documents and statements by detained guerrillas further indicated that the group was formed in Nicaragua at the instigation of high-level Sandi-

nista leaders. The group's chief of operations resided in Managua, and members of the group received military training in Nicaragua and Cuba. Other captured documents revealed that guerrillas at one safehouse were responsible for transporting arms and munitions into Honduras from Estelí, Nicaragua.

103. In Costa Rica, where the Government has attempted to stop the continued use of its territory for supplying weapons to the region's Marxist-Leninist guerrillas, Cuba and Nicaragua targeted the Government's efforts. During 1982, for example, the Cubans and Sandinists provided weapons and training for Costa Rican leftist terrorists. Nicaragua has instigated terrorist actions in Costa Rica, leading to increased tensions between the two countries. Although the Sandinistas denied complicity, the 3 July 1982 bombing of the Honduran airports office in San José took place at Nicaragua's direction, according to Germán Pinzón, a Colombia M-19 member who was arrested by Costa Rican authorities on 14 July. Pinzón, who confessed to placing the bomb, said that Nicaraguan diplomats in Costa Rica had recruited and trained him for the bombing operation. With the help of Pinzón the Costa Rican Government caught the Nicaraguan diplomats *in flagrante*. They were declared *persona non grata* and expelled from Costa Rica on 17 July. Since the beginning of 1982 several guerrilla arms caches and safehouses have been uncovered in Costa Rica. Some arms may be for use by radical groups inside Costa Rica, as well as for shipment to guerrilla movements in El Salvador.

104. The evidence of systematic, continuing aggression by Nicaragua against its Central American neighbours is as clear as the evidence of Nicaragua's repression of its own people and the betrayal of the solemn promises made by its military rulers to the Nicaraguan people, the Organization of American States and the world. Of course, massive intervention in the internal affairs of its neighbours is not the only evidence of the junta's contempt for the principles of non-intervention, respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty, self-determination and the non-use of force.

105. Nicaragua demonstrates contempt for all these principles of the Charter when it supports the Soviet Union's continued brutal occupation of Afghanistan and the Vietnamese invasion and brutal occupation of Cambodia. When its so-called Sandinist governors support the invasion and occupation of those countries and the use of chemical weapons against those peoples, they demonstrate how little they deserve the name Sandinist, how utterly they have betrayed the principles and legacy of Sandino.

106. Pablo Chamorro, editor and publisher of *La Prensa* before his assassination and a writer whose name is from time to time invoked by the leaders of the Nicaraguan revolution, wrote of Sandino—I quoted this passage a year ago [*2337th meeting*] but it is just as relevant today:

> "Sandino should be exalted precisely as a contrast to the communists, who obey signals from Russia and China. Sandino fought against the United States Marines, but he did not bring Russian Cossacks to Nicaragua as Fidel Castro did in Cuba. There is a great difference in the communist Fidel Castro, who in his false battle for the independence of his country has filled it with Russian rockets, soldiers, planes and even canned goods, and a Sandino, who defended the sovereignty of his ground with home-made bombs but without accepting the patronage of another Power. For this reason, Sandino was great—because he was not handed over to communist treason like Castro, but fought within an Indo-Hispanic limit.
>
> "Naturally the communists who attacked and slandered Sandino when he was in the mountains now try to use him, because they have no moral scruple to restrain them. Sandino was a pure product of our land, very different from the products exported by Russia or China, and as such we must exalt and preserve his memory. The value of his exploits has a Nicaraguan value, not Soviet, and his nationalism is indigenous, not Russian.
>
> "Sandino is a monument to the dignity of our country and we must not permit the communists, with whom he never communed, to besmirch his memory in order to use his prestige and to succeed some day, on the pretext that they are fighting imperialism, in delivering our land over to Russia, as Castro did with Cuba."

107. We should not deny, however, that Nicaragua's dictators derive as many benefits from its incorporation into the Soviet bloc as her people derive sorrows. In the Council in the last days we have observed the fraternal support Soviet puppet States provide one another in this arena. We have also observed how they mock the Council's values and procedures.

108. When such basic values of international order as respect for territorial integrity, national independence or human rights are invoked by States such as Grenada, Viet Nam and Cuba, which have already made clear their support for the occupation of Afghanistan and Cambodia and their indifference to the gassing of those peoples; when we hear the representative of the Soviet Union speak of intervention, of mercenaries, of invasions, of subservience, we know we are in the presence of an attempt to sow confusion, not understanding—an exercise in intellectual terrorism which mocks the values of the Charter and, above all, the process of reason on which this body must rely. The Council cannot be taken seriously as a forum for the resolution of disputes if it permits itself to be transformed into a weapon in an ongoing conflict.

109. We are aware of the theory articulated by Friedrich Engels, among others, that there are no neutral processes, that all notions of truth, law and fairness merely reflect economically based power relations. We know that according to this doctrine truth is what the most powerful say it is, and fairness is whatever the most powerful define it to be. We believe that we are witnessing

here an effort to transform the United Nations into an arena where power, as measured by numbers and volume, defines what is good, what is true, what is fair, what is peace.

110. What is true is what the so-called progressive nations say it is. What is fair is what serves their interests. What is legitimate is what expands their power. Thus it is legitimate for communist Governments to train and arm guerrillas and make war on their non-communist neighbours. It is illegitimate for non-communists to attempt to defend themselves or for others to help them to do so. According to this logic, movements which expand communist power are by definition national liberation movements; everything is permitted to achieve their ends. Nothing is permitted to their targets, not even the right of self-defence.

111. We have seen in the past days discouraging indications that the confusion and intimidation have already had insidious effects.

112. We heard Mexico [*2421st meeting*] endorse Nicaragua's right to self-determination and freedom from foreign interference. And in the same speech we heard the same representative of Mexico call for an end to all military assistance to El Salvador, which presumably has no right to self-determination or freedom from foreign intervention.

113. We heard the representative of Zimbabwe [*2422nd meeting*] identify his country and people and their problems with those of the Sandinists and allude darkly to their common experience with powerful, unscrupulous neighbouring nations. We listened to his concern for Nicaragua's independence and territorial integrity and his indifference to the same rights for Nicaragua's neighbours.

114. We heard the representative of Tanzania [*ibid.*] give a distorted account of who is infiltrating terrorists and arms into whose territory and who is seeking peace. We heard him invoke Nicaragua's right to live in peace and choose its own political, social and economic system, without any indication that those rights extended also to its neighbours.

115. We heard the representative of China [*ibid.*] express his admiration for the "Nicaraguan struggle" and call for an end to the intervention of "a super-Power" in the region as though it were only "a super-Power" that posed obstacles to the right of the people of the region to solve their own problems.

116. We listened while the representative of Panama [*2421st meeting*] discussed the problems of Nicaragua without ever mentioning Nicaragua's massive continuing efforts at destabilization of its neighbours.

117. We heard the Pakistani representative express confidence in the Nicaraguan Government's will to peace and non-intervention, its desire to live at peace with its neighbours. In sum, we have heard in the past days repeated indications of the corrosive effects of systematic bias, systematic lies, systematic redefinition of key political values and distortion of the key political processes of this body designed to support international peace.

118. In his Nobel lecture, Alexander Solzhenitsyn confronted again the relationship between tyranny and the systematic distortion of reality. Solzhenitsyn commented:

> "Whoever has once announced violence as his method must inexorably choose lying as his principle. At birth, violence behaves openly and even proudly. But as soon as it becomes stronger and firmly established, it senses the thinning of the air around it and cannot go on without befogging itself in lies, coating itself with lying's sugary oratory. It does not always or necessarily go straight for the gullet: usually it demands of its victims only allegiance to the lie, only complicity in the lie."

119. Whoever in this arena supports Nicaragua's right to commit repression at home and aggression against its neighbours, whoever is ready to respect Nicaragua's right to self-determination, self-government, non-intervention and peace and takes no account of the rights of its neighbours to the same protections against Nicaragua, has become an accomplice in the betrayal of these values and this process. This betrayal is inconsistent with the search for peace. It must be repudiated before this body will be able to participate in the process of conflict resolution. It is not too late for the nations of Central America to forgo violence, to enter on the pathway of negotiations, internal reconciliation, democracy and development. Let us make certain that what happens in this body facilitates that process.

120. The PRESIDENT: The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has asked to speak on a point of order, and I now call on him.

121. Mr. OVINNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): In the light of the nature of the statement of the representative of the United States I would request that I now if possible be given the opportunity to exercise my right of reply. If, however, there is a guarantee that the representative of the United States will not flee the field of battle and will remain until the end of today's meeting, I am willing to speak at that time.

122. The PRESIDENT: The ruling of the President is that the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will speak at the end of today's meeting.

123. I should like to inform members of the Council that I have just received letters from the representatives of Argentina, Peru and Yugoslavia in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discus-

sion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Muñiz (Argentina), Mr. Pastor de la Torre (Peru) and Mr. Silović (Yugoslavia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

124. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of India. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

125. Mr. PURUSHOTTAM (India): Permit me first of all to extend to you, Sir, our felicitations on your assumption of the important office of President of the Security Council for the month of March. Allow me also to add that we in the Indian delegation find special satisfaction in seeing in the Chair a distinguished diplomat who has had a personal association with our country very recently as High Commissioner of the United Kingdom to India. We are confident that under your stewardship the Council will be able to address itself in a purposeful manner to the pressing problems of the present day. We wish you well in the discharge of your onerous responsibilities. May I also add a word of appreciation for your predecessor in the presidency of the Council, Mr. Troyanovsky of the USSR, who guided the Council's deliberations during the past month with dignity and his customary competence.

126. A year ago, when the Council was seized of this question, my delegation made [*2339th meeting*] an earnest appeal for a constructive debate directed not away from, but towards, a dialogue aimed at understanding and reconciliation. We expressed the view that the consideration of the question would have been in vain if it resulted in inflaming passions, deepening mistrust and engendering mutual recrimination.

127. The recent developments in Central America, which the Council is discussing today, have caused all of us deep concern and distress. Once again Nicaragua has come before the Council, pointing out that a serious situation exists in and around its borders as a result of rebel activity. The possibility of a wider conflict in the region looms large on the horizon. The Council has been urged to assume the responsibility entrusted to it under the Charter of the United Nations and to prevent any further intensification of activities likely to result in a breach of peace.

128. The objectives and principles of non-alignment clearly lay down that every State has the right to pursue its own political and social system and to determine the destiny of its own people without any hindrance, interference or intervention. Nicaragua has a rightful expectation that by discharging its functions under the Charter, the Council will help it preserve its independence and territorial integrity. We sincerely believe that, by acting now, the Council will prevent the tensions which have been incipient in the region for some time now from exploding into a horrible war which nobody wants. We must do everything possible to defuse these tensions. Any attempt to involve extra-regional or global forces can result only in exacerbating an already difficult situation in Central America.

129. The heads of State or Government of non-aligned countries, meeting in their Seventh Conference, at New Delhi from 7 to 12 March 1983, had an opportunity to address themselves to Latin American issues. They noted that the final communiqué issued by the Extraordinary Ministerial Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries held at Managua from 10 to 14 January 1983 once again confirmed the universal applicability of the principles and policies of non-alignment and took note with great concern of the continuing tensions in the region. They went on to assert that the processes of change in Central America could not be attributed to or explained by an East-West ideological confrontation. Denouncing the new and increasing threats and acts of intimidation and the growing seriousness and increased number of acts of aggression against Nicaragua, particularly the violation of its airspace and territorial waters, utilization of the territory of foreign countries in and outside the region as bases for aggression and the training of counter-revolutionary forces, and the commission of terrorist acts and sabotage which had resulted in considerable loss of life and property, they considered these as part of a deliberate plan to harass and destabilize Nicaragua.

130. The heads of State or Government also expressed the view that the cessation of military manoeuvres or demonstrations of force would reduce tension and facilitate the necessary dialogue for the achievement of political and negotiated solutions to the problems of the region. They further reaffirmed the right of any State freely to choose its own political, social and economic system as of paramount importance. Commending the peace initiatives presented by Colombia, France, Mexico, Panama and Venezuela seeking to reduce tensions in Central America, the Conference welcomed the positive response of Nicaragua and called on all States concerned to adopt a similar attitude. The heads of State or Government of the non-aligned countries further called on the Governments of the United States of America and Honduras to adopt a constructive position in favour of peace and dialogue, in conformity with the principles of international law.

131. I can do no better than to reaffirm the sentiments expressed by the heads of State or Government of the non-aligned countries and reiterate the fervent call made for constructive dialogue to find a peaceful solution to the present tensions and conflict.

132. It is a matter of grave concern that there has been a dangerous aggravation of the situation in Central America so soon after the call had issued from the New Delhi summit meeting. Nicaragua has come to the Council with a renewed complaint of further acts of intervention directed against its independence and territorial integrity. The seriousness of the situation is such that the Council should not lose time in endless debate but find

ways and means of preventing a deterioration of the situation and a deepening of the conflict, with more loss of innocent lives and property. It is imperative that all armed intervention and action be halted immediately and peace given a chance. Intervention or interference of any kind is inadmissible. Failure to recognize this could lead to incalculable consequences which all of us might have cause to regret.

133. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of the Philippines. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

134. Mr. ARCILLA (Philippines): Allow me to thank you, Mr. President, and through you the other members of the Council for extending an invitation to my delegation to make a statement on the important issue before us.

135. My delegation has requested to be allowed to speak in this debate because of our grave concern over the unfolding developments in Latin America, particularly in Central America, which have ominous consequences for international peace and security.

136. We have strong ties of friendship and co-operation with the countries of the region arising from a common historical past. It is therefore our earnest wish that the sensitive issues facing the region—issues that have engendered an atmosphere of distrust, hostility and confrontation among the States concerned—can be resolved as soon as possible. We believe that the time has come to end mutual recriminations and the hurling of vitriol at one another. While we are completely aware of the complexity and sensitivity of the issues involved, we venture to say with a deep sense of conviction that the time has come for all the parties concerned to sit down and engage in dialogue with a view to forging a mutually acceptable solution to the problems that beset the Central American region. We are convinced that, given the political will of the States concerned, a structure of peace can be achieved. The resolution of the conflict could only redound to the benefit of the man in the street on whose behalf, after all, we all strive to create a world of peace, freedom, social justice and prosperity.

137. In this context, we would like to commend to the parties concerned the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations on the peaceful settlement of disputes. Non-intervention and non-interference in the internal affairs of States, respect for the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of States, the inadmissibility of the threat or use of force in the settlement of disputes and its corollary, the necessity to resort to peaceful means in the settlement of disputes among States, come to mind. These, we believe, are the basic elements that could form the basis for meaningful and constructive negotiations among the parties concerned that would lead to the lessening of tensions and, ultimately, to a peaceful settlement of the conflict in the region.

138. At the same time it is incumbent upon us to seize every opportunity to build upon the search for this common goal. In this connection we note in particular the Final Act forged in San José last 4 October 1982.[7] We find that the conditions set forth in that document provide a good basis for the peaceful resolution of the problems and outstanding issues affecting the area. My delegation believes that no one can dispute the validity of the conditions necessary to achieve peace, as enumerated in the San José document.

139. As members of the international community, it is our solemn duty and obligation to promote international peace and security through the mechanisms provided for under the Charter. It behoves the United Nations, in particular the Security Council, to undertake constructive measures that would assist the countries of Central America to live in peace and in harmony with each other, for the present situation in the area, unless defused, could seriously threaten world peace and security.

140. As it is not my intention to break tradition—a worthy one, at that—allow me before concluding, Sir, to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Council. Given the wealth of your experience and your sterling diplomatic qualities, we are confident that the Council will achieve constructive results under your chairmanship. Allow me also to felicitate most warmly your predecessor, Mr. Troyanovsky of the Soviet Union, on the excellent manner in which he conducted the affairs of the Council.

141. The PRESIDENT: The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has asked to speak in exercise of his right of reply, and I now call on him.

142. Mr. OVINNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): In my statement I have already said that when the representatives of the United States speak about the "Red danger" it is a pretext to divert our attention and to cover up their own interventionist plans. The representative of the United States today inflated the "Red threat" to even greater proportions, extending it over practically the whole world. But I will not be taken in by this attempt to disguise the true intentions of the United States.

143. I should like to say a few words strictly on the agenda before us. On the agenda is one item—an accusation against the United States to the effect that it has been preparing, has already unleashed and has been responsible for interventionism against a small Latin American country, Nicaragua.

144. Nicaragua and many other countries in Latin America have genuine grounds to be apprehensive of intervention by the United States. I have already given two examples today of how the United States organized intervention in 1954 against Guatemala and an unsuccessful attempt at invading Cuba in April 1961, but I should like to give the Council one more list, which must make it evident to everyone why the Latin American countries fear intervention by the United States.

145. I should like to recount a list of cases in which the United States used armed force against other Latin American countries also, cases in which the overwhelming majority of interventions were carried out at a time when the Soviet Union was not even on the map of the world. Here is the list. Against Mexico, the United States used force 14 times; against Cuba, 13 times; against Panama, 11 times; against Nicaragua, 10 times; against the Dominican Republic, nine times; against Colombia, seven times; against Honduras, seven times; against Haiti, five times; against Puerto Rico, three times; against Guatemala, twice. Thus, against just 10 Latin American countries, the United States has used force 81 times. These are the grounds for the fears of the Latin American countries in so far as concerns the current policy of the United States.

146. But let us suppose for a moment that the United States representative really believes what she says about the "Red danger". Let us suppose for a moment that there is a genuine fear of the "Reds" and that it really seems to them, as they say here in the United States, that "there is a Red under every bed". So the question arises, what should these official persons in the United States do? I have some advice for them. Experience here is the best guide. Let these people take a look under their own beds. Let them see that there are not any "Reds" there. What, one may ask, quite understandably, should one do after that? Pay a visit to the doctor.

147. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Zimbabwe has asked to speak in exercise of his right of reply, and I now call on him.

148. Mr. MASHINGAIDZE (Zimbabwe): The representative of the United States made reference to our comparison of the situation in Nicaragua and Central America with that prevailing in southern Africa and even went further and accused those who support Nicaragua of being accessories after the fact.

149. Much as we want to go further, we should not be diverted from the item on the agenda, which really relates to interference in the affairs of Nicaragua. We would want to emphasize that our support, our championing of this policy of non-interference, our upholding of this principle, is guided by our desire to uphold the Charter of the United Nations, and we shall continue to uphold it. We shall never support interference by whoever it might be, for whatever reason, in whatever country, at whatever time and, allow me to underline, least of all in this honourable chamber.

150. Our duty is to create an atmosphere conducive to peaceful solution of the dispute in Nicaragua and to help resolve that dispute. My delegation has, I think, voted accordingly whenever we have seen that there was interference, no matter who had interfered, and we shall continue to do so.

151. The PRESIDENT: The representative of China has asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply, and I now call on him.

152. Mr. LIANG Yufan (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): Just now the representative of the United States made an accusation with regard to the statement made by China yesterday [*2422nd meeting*]. The Chinese delegation rejects this accusation by the United States delegation. It is not difficult for people to see that the representative of the United States accuses all delegations that do not agree with the mistaken policy of the United States Government. This is the very repugnant style of a super-Power. The interference by the United States in the affairs of the countries of the Central American region is known to all. It does not matter to what extent the United States representative engages in sophistry. That cannot change the tarnished image of the United States Government as a super-Power.

153. The PRESIDENT: The representative of the United States has asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply, and I now call on her.

154. Mrs. KIRKPATRICK (United States of America): I shall comment first of all concerning the Soviet representative's exercise in cliometrics and say that it suffered from what such quantitative historical analyses often do, namely, the effort to add up non-additive—that is, non-comparable—events. Most of the non-comparable events which he attempted to add were drawn from a really quite remote past.

155. Fortunately, however, we are a new nation and his list was relatively short, particularly since we left any kind of interventionist habits in back of us a long time ago.

156. Now, if we were to attempt to do a comparative kind of analysis of Soviet acts of aggression against neighbouring peoples, the job would, I am afraid, require a computer, the quantities being so great. One would, of course, begin with the peoples of the so-called autonomous Soviet Socialist Republics themselves—for example, the Ukraine—and the peoples of Tashkent, Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia. I am choosing almost at random. There is, of course, more recently and miserably, the people of Afghanistan. The truth is that the Soviet record of armed aggression against the peoples of its own empire is so well known that it does not really bear repetition.

157. May I say that I am terribly pleased to hear the representative of Zimbabwe affirm his dedication to the universality of the principle of non-intervention. That is in fact what the Charter of the United Nations requires of all of us, something which, we hope, all of us are in fact prepared to grant.

158. In so far as the representative of China is concerned, one can hope that they too will affirm that same universality in application of the principle of non-interference in the affairs of other nations.

159. The PRESIDENT: The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply, and I now call on him.

160. Mr. OVINNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): I would therefore like to note that the representative of the United States did not deny the list of 81 United States interventions against Latin American countries which I read out. She simply said that something was in the past and that now everything was new. So to supplement my own education, I should like, if possible, to receive from the representative of the United States an answer to such questions as these, for example. The United States intervention of 1954 in Guatemala—was that an old intervention or a new one? The intervention of 1961 against Cuba—was that an old one or a new one? The intervention of 1965 in another Latin American republic—was that an old one or a new one?

161. The PRESIDENT: The representative of the United States has asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply, and I now call on her.

162. Mrs. KIRKPATRICK (United States of America): First I should like to point out to my colleague from the Soviet Union that the country in 1965 for whose name he was searching was the Dominican Republic, which today enjoys independence and democracy.

163. As one of my colleagues has pointed out to me quite correctly, there is, of course, one very important difference between those countries in which the United States in an earlier time and in an earlier mode occasionally intervened and those Governments, States and peoples in whose internal affairs the Soviet Union has intervened. That difference, above all, is that, like the Dominican Republic, the States which were the object of United States intervention are today independent States, largely democratic States, which enjoy self-government and self-determination, whereas those States, like Afghanistan or Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia or any other nations of Eastern Europe, which had the misfortune to be intervened in by the Soviet Union have not to this day re-established their autonomy.

164. The PRESIDENT: The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply. I call on him.

165. Mr. OVINNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): If I said something that was not quite correct and instead of "Dominican Republic" said something else, then I was properly corrected by the representative of the United States. After all, who but the representative of the United States could know better exactly where the intervention of 1965 by the United States took place? I am therefore grateful to her for this factual correction of my inaccuracy.

166. But now I should like to put a key question to the representative of the United States—key to this meeting of the Security Council today. Can the representative of the United States tell the Council here that the United States has no aggressive designs whatsoever against the Republic of Nicaragua? Can she say that, or not?

167. The PRESIDENT: The representative of the United States has asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply. I call on her.

168. Mrs. KIRKPATRICK (United States of America): I should like to reply unequivocally that the United States Government has no aggressive designs against the Government of Nicaragua, against the Nicaraguan people; that the United States indeed has no intention of invading anyone or of conducting an armed action against anyone, or of occupying any other country. The United States Government, indeed, has no interest in any territorial aggrandizement whatsoever, and as far as the people of Nicaragua are concerned, we desire nothing whatsoever for the people of Nicaragua except precisely the fulfilment of those promises which the Government of Nicaragua—the Sandinist Junta of Nicaragua—made to those people on its accession to power.

169. The PRESIDENT: The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply. I call on him.

170. Mr. OVINNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): We shall believe in the sincerity of the statement of the representative of the United States with regard to Nicaragua only when that country calls a halt to the preparation, training, arming and equipping of the Somozist bands operating against Nicaragua in its territory.

171. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Honduras has asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply. I call on him.

172. Mr. ORTEZ COLINDRES (Honduras) (*interpretation from Spanish*): We have heard the two Goliaths—Goliaths in terms of power and of intellect. Small countries can learn a lot from them. They evoke all the insight that can be brought to bear in order that those they might regard as international pygmies in this forum may be given the same international standing, even though we do not have—like those who forged that right after the Second World War—the privilege of vetoing draft resolutions in the Council. That really destroys the fundamental balance between a small country and a Power. I refer to points on which there is a real imbalance in the international community, when the veto is employed and the hopes and aspirations of the small countries are dashed. But reality is almost always the most tragic thing: they fight, they laugh and we provide the dead.

173. I should like to speak on behalf of one small country that is affected, solely to clarify our position in this debate.

174. I should not like to tangle with my Nicaraguan colleague in a theological or an ideological struggle or one about alignment, because such is not our intention. On the contrary, we should like sincerely to contribute to providing the Council with all the necessary information to prevent an international conflagration. He has made

some official charges. I have three more here, but I think we have heard enough. One of them concerns the mobilization of Nicaraguan troops: yesterday, more than 100 lorries bearing armed troops arrived at our border. In addition, boats were captured, and Honduran citizens were arrested and taken to Nicaragua. However, we are relating all this with, as the French say, *un sens de la mesure*, for the basic problem is something else; these are incidents.

175. We are fulfilling our obligation to inform the Council. The complaints will be circulated, and I have no wish to return to the ping-pong game where Nicaragua says that our soldiers are firing on them and we say that Nicaraguan soldiers are firing on ours.

176. The fact is that my Government officially announces categorically that it has no wish to commit aggression against or to attack the Nicaraguan army. The Council must realize perfectly well, because it is composed of persons versed in international law, that at a time of tension one shot by a soldier is not international aggression. People in our countries are nervous. The armies are nearby, and the right attitude taken here might prevent a conflagration there, because there people are tense. There there is no laughter; there is no assumption of intellectual attitudes, nor any reviewing of the history of invasions. We are ourselves experiencing the additional problems of our poverty and our weakness, serious armed confrontations and profound differences.

177. I am going somewhat to disregard specific complaints, which will be sent to the Council in writing.

178. The fears of the Government of Nicaragua that an international war might be unleashed by Honduras are groundless. We can give them our unqualified assurance that the Honduran army is not going to attack or commit aggression against Nicaragua. We have made a solemn promise. This is a Security Council in which international history will record our words, as well as our attitude as a serious Government which is attempting to forge credibility in the world. Consequently, I have received precise instructions to inform the Council that the army will not move in. Any troop movements on our part will be to defend our sovereignty and our territorial integrity. It is logical that we should take measures.

179. Everyone is talking about internationalization of a conflict. I do not believe that the parties involved in this conflict are standing by with folded arms. Accordingly my country's attitude is one of peace.

180. The representative of Nicaragua says that he wishes to participate sincerely in the search for peace, and he reiterates that it is a matter of the utmost urgency that we engage in bilateral negotiations. There he has a point of agreement. Nicaragua wants negotiations. Honduras also wants negotiations. Where does the difference lie? The difference is that Nicaragua maintains its criterion that those negotiations must be bilateral, because the parties affected are those that, primarily and as a matter of priority, have had their interests affected. My country believes that our bilateral problems can on the contrary be considered, but that the problem is not one between Nicaragua and Honduras. We have just heard the representatives of the Soviet Union and the United States.

181. Let us ask ourselves a question and let us provide the answer ourselves. Commander Ortega Saavedra visited Moscow today, as was announced by the representative of the Soviet Union—Russia—and that Government offered its cordial support to Nicaragua. We must take into account the fact that he is not walking about in the harsh Moscow winter buying chestnuts, as we are doing in New York, but that, in some form, he is discussing questions of greater importance regarding stability and instability in the region.

182. We are seeking the point, the basic opportunity. As intelligent and experienced persons, help us to see how to structure this dialogue, which Honduras also considers to be vital and urgent. Why can we not accept the notion of beginning solely with the bilateral approach? That would be as if our problem were a crab which, with two of its legs immobilized, could continue to move since we know that six legs still remain, if it had eight legs to begin with.

183. We believe that this is a regional problem and that binding two legs of the crab will not enable us to resolve it, because the crab will continue moving. Weapons continue moving through our territory with the aim of destabilizing the Government of El Salvador. We will continue mobilizing troops to prevent the movement of those weapons, and so on and so forth, so that once again a state of confusion will reign. Consequently, let us take a global and simultaneous approach to the problem and speak of bilateral and regional matters. Why should it be possible to speak of the white and not be possible to speak of the black? Let us speak of the white and the black at the same time. There is not just coffee and milk in history; there is also coffee with milk. I think that more coffee with milk is drunk than is black coffee or pure milk. Accordingly, it seems to me perfectly proper that, under the sponsorship of an international organization, under the auspices of a forum as solemn as this one, it should be possible to find this *sens de la mesure*, this break-even point that would act as a link, the vital spark. Let us not solely continue seeking negative angles that are going to exacerbate the problem.

184. They refer to a very important point. Nicaragua says that it wants to revitalize the proposal made by Mexico and Venezuela. We certainly do not want to weaken that proposal in any way. What do we understand by "revitalize"? Sometimes it is necessary to give to words their true legal meaning and not their grammatical sense. Every proposal has deep implications. In some of these proposals it is suggested that European countries take part in the dialogue. I wonder if it will be necessary for Europe to solve the problems of five countries that once formed a federal republic. Can we as Central Americans be so incompetent that we are unable to converse as

we once did, as five brothers? Are we going to ask that the dialogue be translated into German, Italian or English when we share the same lineage, the same history, the same blood and the same suffering? It seems to me that there is a constructive way of dealing with the problem. Let us not make it worse than it is. We do not want to extrapolate this problem and make of Central America a Viet Nam. We do not want Central America to become a Lebanon, a Middle East, a Poland. We do not want to be a pawn on a chess-board. It is possible that this will not be the case, but we pray and we agree with what the Pope said and we listened seriously to what was booed by the masses there, because we believe in God, not in atheistic systems. But we respect atheists. Before they have to face God, perhaps they will be convinced of His existence. Everyone has his own ideas and the right to believe them in regard to where he comes from and where he is going.

185. The representative of Nicaragua says that we can move step by step in regional negotiations. Wonderful. Where do we begin? When do we begin? They say they view with sympathy the proposal[4] by four fraternal countries that have credibility for us: Colombia, a democracy; Panama, a friendly country; and Mexico and Venezuela—that is to say, four ideal negotiating partners. However, we should like it if democracy—and we are not going to judge Governments at the present time, but we do believe in democracy as a system—could somehow be established and strengthened in Central America and that Nicaragua might choose the type of government or the plan of government it wishes. That is completely up to the Nicaraguans; the choice is theirs.

186. I have great respect for Cuba. Cuba has said bad things to us on several occasions, but they have given us some good things. This tobacco which is bad for one's health is a Cuban vice. I was sympathetic to Fidel Castro at university. I was happy to see his beard, as I am now happy to see the beard of the Deputy Minister of Nicaragua and that which my friend its ambassador just shaved off. But our sympathies don't concern hair; our ideological interest is in a system, democracy, and we would have put Fidel Castro on a pedestal and be admiring him today if he had given his people freedom of choice. But that is his business. It is the Cubans' problem; it is not up to me to judge. I am a romantic of history.

187. The representative of Nicaragua says that positive steps should be taken as a matter of urgency and that he is open-minded about any consideration or proposal by the Council. Well, we are too. What does the Council want? We have asked the Secretary-General—a serious man, a Latin American who since his election has enjoyed the confidence of the Soviet Union, the United States, France, China, the United Kingdom—and those Latin American men in whom we believe and who are moral forces whom you have chosen and respected, to help us seek a balance so that we can put an end to this ping-pong exchange and so that Nicaragua will not return here tomorrow with three more complaints. My secretaries are tired of typing out copies of these complaints. Believe me, I do not want to continue throwing oil on the fire.

188. We respect the Council's time. My country's Foreign Minister has asked the President that we meet with him on Monday so that we can settle this. I wish the Foreign Minister of Nicaragua would come too, not because we cannot do the job but so that he could see that commitments are serious matters. I am not saying whatever happens to pop into my mind. I smoke cigarettes, not marijuana. I am speaking very seriously.

189. Let me be specific. How could we possibly not want Nicaragua, a brother of ours, to choose its own Government? How could we not respect its right to self-determination? Would it not be a sorry matter for a country like Honduras to lend its territory for an invasion? We have a Government that was elected by more than 82 per cent of our population. Our Political Constitution is the basis of everything. Any traffic in weapons, any movements by armies, have to be considered by a legislative body which is respected, just as the American Senate and the Politburo—or whatever is the legislative body in the Soviet Union—are respected.

190. But, my Nicaraguan brothers, let us not pray and light one candle to God and another to the devil. We want you to be independent, but we also want El Salvador, a country we love, to be independent too, and out of respect for the principle of non-intervention we desire you not to intervene in our territory. We will sign such a bilateral or multilateral commitment, but only on condition that you do not destabilize the region.

191. I should like to end with a saying: "What is good for the goose is good for the gander". Help us to forge a dialogue, since the basic corner-stone of such a dialogue is accepted by both sides. We do not want internationalization of the conflict. We do not want armies clashing on our borders. And if we all agree on the fundamental point, what is missing? Perhaps the humility I must have to seek your experience. Perhaps something positive could come of it. Is there going to be condemnation of the United States or of the Soviet Union? What help would that be? Another piece of paper to veto? That would be of no help at all; only $300 more for each page in six languages. That is not what we want. I have just come from my country believing in law. I studied public international law because I truly believe that legal norms do exist. But I do not want this conflict that I am today experiencing to be an example of what my professor, the great internationalist Charles Rousseau, taught in his class on the United Nations. He said that the International Court of Justice, the international body that implements the principles of this sacred Organization, always had to take into account three possible results in any conflict. First, whenever there was a conflict between a major country and a small country the big country would win. Secondly, whenever there was a conflict between two small countries, as in the case of Nicaragua and Honduras, the conflict would disappear. Thirdly, whenever there was a conflict between two major Powers,

such as the Soviet Union and the United States, the Court would disappear. Well, I hope that the Council will not disappear on this occasion.

192. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Nicaragua wishes to speak in the exercise of the right of reply. I call upon him.

193. Mr. TINOCO (Nicaragua) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I shall try to return to the tone of seriousness that should characterize debates in the Council. I should like to refer to one matter that was raised by the representative of the United States in one of her last statements. I do not believe this will be an unnecessary exercise; I think it will help the members of the Council to understand to some extent the dilemma in which Nicaragua finds itself. I think it will help the Council understand the problems and dilemmas of the Latin American countries, the countries south of the Rio Grande.

194. The representative of the United States referred to the founder of the Sandinist movement in our country, and quite rightly she said that Sandino was not a communist. Where there was a mistake, where there has always been a mistake, a mistake that will continue into the future, is that one does not have to be a communist to be anti-imperialist, to defend one's homeland, to defend national rights, to defend national resources and to speak clearly and show unambiguously that one is opposed to those who are committing aggression against the homeland and trying to destroy it.

195. Sandino, then, was not a communist. But he knew what the United States stood for, and he knew that the United States was imperialistic and would continue to be imperialistic. He knew what harm was being done to the peoples of Latin America and would continue to be done to them. And for that reason I should like to read out a few quotations from Sandino, who was not a communist but a patriot, a nationalist, an anti-imperialist and a man who understood the power that the United States has historically exerted over our peoples.

196. Sandino said, "The genuine criminals are in the bowels of the White House in Washington, whence they direct the plundering and destruction of our Hispanic America." On another occasion he wrote in his diary about his fight against the Marines, who had intervened in our country in 1934, "The last of my soldiers may die, the soldiers of Nicaraguan freedom, but before that more than a battalion of yours, the blond invader, will have perished in our rugged mountains." It is unfortunate that the representative of the United States is not present to hear these quotations, for they might have given her food for thought. Sandino also said—and this is important for Latin America—in his message to the Presidents of Latin America on 4 August 1928, at the start of his struggle against American intervention:

> "I wonder whether the Governments of Latin America believe that the Yankees will be satisfied with the conquest of Nicaragua. I wonder whether those Governments have forgotten that of the 21 Latin American republics six have already lost their sovereignty: Panama, Puerto Rico, Cuba, Haiti, Santo Domingo and Nicaragua are the six unfortunate republics which have lost their independence and become colonies of Yankee imperialism. The Governments of those six peoples are not defending the collective interests of their nationals, because they came to power not through the popular will but through the imposition of imperialism. Those who rise to the presidency supported by the magnates in Wall Street are defending the interests of the North American bankers. All that remains in those six unhappy Hispanic American peoples is the memory that they were once independent and the distant hope of being able to win back their freedom through the strength of a few of their sons who are fighting tirelessly to loose their country from the opprobrium into which those renegades have plunged it."

Sandino, a man who was not a communist but a staunch anti-imperalist, a man capable of defining the role of the United States both then and in the future, also stated, "We must think about our unification and understand that Yankee imperialism is the most brutal enemy threatening us." Elsewhere, he said, "The Yankees need puppets to make presidents for our indohispanic peoples." Perhaps even more emotionally, Sandino wrote on another occasion giving an example of what has come to be known as Sandinist rhetoric, a rhetoric inspired by the hardship caused our people by American aggression. Speaking about the Yankees, he said:

> "Come, you drug addicts, come and kill us, in our own land, for at the vanguard of my patriot soldiers I will wait for you, caring little for your numbers. But when that happens, the destruction of your greatness will shake the Capitol in Washington and your blood will stain the famous White House, the den where you plot your infamous crimes."

197. Those were the words of Augusto César Sandino, a patriot who championed the freedom and independence of Nicaragua. He was assassinated in 1934 in a plot involving the then Secretary of State of the United States and Henry L. Stimson, American ambassador to Nicaragua.

198. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Cuba has asked to speak in exercise of his right of reply. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

199. Mr. ROA KOURÍ (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I am truly afraid that the Council's seriousness may have been gravely compromised and its credibility threatened after the unusual statements we have heard this afternoon from one of its permanent members. At the beginning of the debate, the representative of the United States regaled us with a strange dissertation, the smug, didactic tone of which might perhaps have given great pleasure to a group of American college freshmen but which was obviously inappropriate in a gathering of

sovereign and independent States and of adults who long ago left the university classroom.

200. Curious theories were expounded earlier by the representative of the United States on the subject of Nicaragua's complaint to the Council, perhaps because the need to become involved in theory is something she cannot eschew. But it is one thing to go into theory in the ivory tower of academe and something else to examine facts. The facts, as Vladimir Ilyich Lenin said—and I am sure that Professor Kirkpatrick remembers—are actually greater than the imagination, because life is simply richer than theory. Nevertheless both in her earlier harangue and in today's peroration, the representative of the United States has stubbornly resisted facing facts, carefully avoiding a reply to the specific charges levelled by the Deputy Minister for External Relations of Nicaragua.

201. Would the American representative be good enough to tell us once and for all whether or not it is true that there are camps for the training of Nicaraguan counter-revolutionaries on United States territory; whether or not it is true that the CIA has received State funds for the development of covert operations against the Government of Nicaragua; whether or not it is true that her Government is involved in attempts to destabilize the Sandinist Government of Nicaragua? We await her replies with keen interest.

202. With regard to other matters I should like to say the following. The Government of the United States arrogates to itself the right to intervene in any part of the world where its interests, as it perceives and defines them, are threatened. Presumably it is for that reason that it finances and arms the genocidal junta in El Salvador, as it is undoubtedly for that same reason that it assists, supports and financially and militarily helps the racists of Pretoria and the Zionists of Israel. On the other hand, they are indignant because Cuba considers that it has the right to assist revolutionaries anywhere in the world. We are speaking of double standards. Could it be because Cuba is a small mulatto country, which from the time of President Adams, through McKinley and Theodore Roosevelt, was considered the private property of the Yankee empire?

203. The representative of the United States referred to the so-called interventionist designs of Cuba and Nicaragua but arrogated the right to question the foreign policy of both sovereign States and their right to support anyone, anywhere, in any international dispute or conflict. What is more, like Cato, she thunders curses against other States Members of the United Nations and of the Security Council for daring to support tiny Nicaragua in its complaint. Obviously, arrogance does not seem to be giving her good advice, and it has very little to do with Emerson's spirit of temperance which, I presume, might at some time have found its way into the lectures given by the representative of the United States.

204. Finally, I do not wish to omit something which is simply infuriating to any Latin American—the alleged tribute which the representative of the United States pretended to pay to Sandino. That Sandino's murderers tried to use his clean name to attack Cuban and Nicaraguan revolutionaries deserves our deepest contempt. But the substance of the message is something else and very different. It is not that they copied his anti-imperialist, let us say anti-Yankee, struggle, which is what we revolutionaries of Latin America have all done, but that it should be done with old revolvers, sticks and stones, in order the better to murder them, as was the case with Sandino.

205. All right, with old revolvers and shotguns we Cubans faced the tyranny of Fulgencio Batista, who was armed by the United States and advised by Yankee military personnel, and we defeated it. But we are not so stupid—because stupidity is not really one of the defects of revolutionaries—as to confront the most powerful of empires with home-made guns and shotguns. Let there be no doubt on the part of the representatives of the United States. Our people is armed, very well armed, and, what is more, better prepared to make sure that imperialism pays very dearly for any attempted aggression against our homeland.

206. In a country where human brotherhood is something that exists only in museums and on paper, we should not be surprised to hear ironic references to the fraternal relations that exist between Cuba and Nicaragua and between my homeland and that of Lenin. We are proud of those relations, and today more than ever we strengthen our fraternal solidarity with the Sandinist Government and the Nicaraguan people and the heroic revolutionaries of El Salvador and Guatemala.

207. The PRESIDENT: The representative of the United States of America has asked to be allowed to speak in exercise of the right of reply, and I call on him.

208. Mr. LICHENSTEIN (United States of America): I apologize if I begin this brief statement by sounding academic. It occurred to one of my colleagues to remind me that the great Spanish philosopher Unamuno once said that when he saw something that looked much like a crab, walked like a crab, behaved like a crab, others might call it a turtle but, for his part, he would call it a crab.

209. We did not claim—and we regard it as irrelevant to claim—that the great Sandino was a communist. We say only that those today who use his name have betrayed his fierce independence and have yielded their sovereignty, indeed their national pride, to an outside Power.

210. I wish to reiterate the final words of Mrs. Kirkpatrick in her last statement this afternoon. Our Government harbours no aggressive designs, on any country within the hemisphere or outside the hemisphere. As between my country and the people I represent and the people of Nicaragua, and indeed the people of Cuba,

there are no—there need not be—differences. In so far as the Governments of Nicaragua and indeed of Cuba enhance the freedom and the well-being of their people, in so far as those Governments do not commit aggression against their neighbours, there need not be, and there will not be, any differences, any divisions, between their Governments and mine, between their people and mine.

The meeting rose at 7.20 p.m.

NOTES

[1] General Assembly resolution 2625 (XXV), annex.

[2] General Assembly resolution 36/103, annex.

[3] *Ibid.*, part II.

[4] See A/38/68, annex.

[5] See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-seventh Session, Supplement No. 1* (A/37/1), p. 3.

[6] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-seventh Session, Supplement No. 1* (A/37/1).

[7] Final Act of the Meeting of Foreign Ministers of the countries interested in the promotion of democracy in Central America and the Caribbean. For the text, see Jack W. Hopkins, ed., *Latin America and Caribbean Contemporary Record* (New York and London, Holmes & Meier, 1984), vol. II, 1982-1983, pp. 867-873.

Litho in United Nations, New York 00400 60205—July 1990—2,050

UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-EIGHTH YEAR

2424th MEETING: 28 MARCH 1983

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2424)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
Letter dated 22 March 1983 from the Deputy Minister for External Relations of Nicaragua addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15651)	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/ . . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council.* The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council.* The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

2424th MEETING

Held in New York on Monday, 28 March 1983, at 11 a.m.

President: Sir John THOMSON (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland).

Present: The representatives of the following States: China, France, Guyana, Jordan, Malta, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Poland, Togo, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire, Zimbabwe.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2424)

1. Adoption of the agenda.

2. Letter dated 22 March 1983 from the Deputy Minister for External Relations of Nicaragua addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15651).

The meeting was called to order at 12.05 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Letter dated 22 March 1983 from the Deputy Minister for External Relations of Nicaragua addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15651)

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decisions taken at previous meetings on this item [*2420th to 2423rd meetings*], I invite the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Honduras to take a place at the Security Council table. I invite the representatives of Algeria, Argentina, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, the Dominican Republic, the Federal Republic of Germany, Ecuador, Grenada, India, the Islamic Republic of Iran, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritius, Mexico, Panama, Peru, the Philippines, Spain, the United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam and Yugoslavia to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Paz Barnica (Honduras) took a place at the Council table. Mr. Abada (Algeria), Mr. Muñiz (Argentina), Mr. Moseley (Barbados), Miss Dever (Belgium), Mr. Salazar Paredes (Bolivia), Mr. Bueno (Brazil), Mr. Sanz de Santamaría (Colombia), Mr. Zumbado Jiménez (Costa Rica), Mr. Roa Kourí (Cuba), Mr. Al-Alfi (Democratic Yemen), Mr. Knipping Victoria (Dominican Republic), Mr. Jelonek (Federal Republic of Germany), Mr. Albornoz (Ecuador), Mr. Taylor (Grenada), Mr. Purushottam (India), Mr. Serajzadeh (Islamic Republic of Iran), Mr. Treiki (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Mr. Maudave (Mauritius), Mr. Muñoz Ledo (Mexico), Mr. Ozores Typaldos (Panama), Mr. Pastor de la Torre (Peru), Mr. Arcilla (Philippines), Mr. de Piniés (Spain) Mr. Rupia (United Republic of Tanzania), Mrs. Coronel de Rodríguez (Venezuela) Mr. Hoang Bich Son (Viet Nam) and Mr. Silović (Yugoslavia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

2. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Bulgaria, El Salvador, the German Democratic Republic, Italy, Mongolia and the Syrian Arab Republic in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Tsvetkov (Bulgaria), Mr. Rosales Rivera (El Salvador), Mr. Ott (German Democratic Republic), Mr. La Rocca (Italy), Mr. Narkhuu (Mongolia) and Mr. El-Fattal (Syrian Arab Republic) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

3. The PRESIDENT: The Security Council will now resume its consideration of the item on its agenda. I should like to draw the attention of members of the Council to the following documents: S/15654, a letter dated 24 March 1983 from the representative of Mongolia to the President of the Security Council; and S/15656, a letter dated 25 March 1983 from the Deputy Minister for External Relations of Nicaragua to the President of the Security Council.

4. The first speaker is the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Honduras, Mr. Edgardo Paz Barnica. I welcome him and invite him to make his statement.

5. Mr. PAZ BARNICA (Honduras) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I wanted to speak personally in this debate to reiterate what the representative of Honduras has already said in this international forum and to clear up any doubts that might still exist concerning the position of my Government on the painful internal conflict that is now occurring in the sister Republic of Nicaragua.

6. It is unusual for a State member of the Organization of American States (OAS), which Nicaragua is, to have recourse to the Security Council without having first addressed itself to the regional body, in keeping with Article 52, paragraph 2, of the Charter of the United Nations and in accordance with the provisions of the Charter of the Organization of American States. However, my Government is not shunning debate in this world Organization, and it is participating in it in the hope that we can agree on a civilized and peaceful solution to the complex problems of Central America.

7. I have said and wish to repeat that the Government of Nicaragua is involved in an armed struggle of an internal nature: Nicaraguans are fighting against Nicaraguans on Nicaraguan soil. The present outbreak of violence, unfortunately, is not sudden or unexpected. To any impartial observer it was obvious that a few months after the triumph of the Sandinist Revolution—which had aroused such high hopes at the time of victory over the dictatorship—it had begun like Saturn to devour its own sons. Members of the Governing Junta of National Reconstruction, like other high State officials, had not only abandoned their governmental functions but had also openly and resolutely joined the opposition. Among others there were Violeta de Chamorro, Alfonso Robelo, Arturo Cruz, ex-members of the Governing Junta; Edén Pastora, a hero of the Revolution, ex-Deputy Minister of Defence and former Chief of the Sandinist People's Militia; and many others who did not wish to take part in diverting the Revolution from it original concepts. As cause or effect of that fact, the régime has turned repressive. The prisons are full of political prisoners, basic individual and social guarantees have been restricted and freedom of the press and even of worship have been limited, as was obvious during the recent pastoral visit to Nicaragua of His Holiness Pope John Paul II. All that deserved rejection by men of good will throughout the world.

8. In the face of this sombre picture, aggravated by an enormous economic crisis, the Government of Nicaragua, using a hackneyed tactic, has decided to make one or more enemies in Central America, and nothing has been more convenient than to blame some of its immediate neighbours, including Honduras, for what has happened or might happen in Nicaragua. Gradually, relations between the States in the area have become tense, both because of the border incidents provoked by the Sandinist forces and the unfounded and brazen accusations that attempts are being made to destabilize the Nicaraguan Government.

9. In order fully to comprehend how absurd those accusations are, it is necessary to take a look at history. In 1980, after nearly 20 years of *de facto* and irregular Governments Honduras undertook, with perseverance and sacrifice, to return to democratic institutions. It held elections for representatives to the National Constituent Assembly on 20 April 1980 in a climate of peace, freedom and honesty; a new Constitution for the Repubic was adopted; and, while neighbouring countries were involved in violence, the Honduran people returned to the polls in 1981 to elect the President of the Republic, representatives to the National Congress and municipal mayors, with the participation of more than 80 per cent of the electorate, and won international praise. The process towards Honduras democratization culminated on 27 January 1982 when President Roberto Suazo Córdova assumed the presidency, supported by the majority of the Honduran people, in the presence of various officials of American countries, including Commander Daniel Ortega Saavedra, the Co-ordinator of the Governing Junta of National Reconstruction of the Republic of Nicaragua.

10. The primary concern of the new Honduran Government in internal matters was to maintain tranquillity in the country, strengthen democratic institutions and promote the economic and social development of the nation. Externally, our primary goal has been peaceful coexistence with all the countries of the Earth by strict implementation of the principles contained in the Charter of the Organization, especially those of non-intervention in the internal affairs of other States, the right of peoples to self-determination and the obligation to settle international disputes by peaceful means.

11. For that reason, barely two months after the new Government took power, on 23 March 1982, it submitted to the Permanent Council of the OAS a peace proposal for Central America [*see S/14919*] made up of six points which can be summed up as follows: first, to agree on the cessation of the arms race in the area, the reduction of arms and the prohibition of the importation of military supplies—all in the interest of achieving general disarmament; secondly, to reduce and eliminate foreign advisers, military and others; thirdly, to agree on the cessation and prevention of illegal trafficking in arms in the region; fourthly, to agree on a system of international supervision and control of the agreements reached; fifthly, to refrain from creating new territorial or maritime disputes that might aggravate the situation in the region; and sixthly, to promote a multilateral dialogue of a regional and permanent nature, making possible domestic political agreements for the establishment of democratic and pluralistic régimes based on the free, proper and honest expression of the will of the people. Between then and now my country's Government has done its utmost to see to it that that proposal and any other designed to achieve the same peaceful end become a reality, to the benefit of the entire region of Central America.

12. On this occasion Honduras reaffirms its unshakeable decision to begin as soon as possible a multilateral dialogue, first and foremost with the Central American countries and open to other democratically governed Latin American countries in the Caribbean. We believe that this is the right way to reach responsible and serious agreements that will strengthen peace and security in the region. A number of States have accepted this initiative. However, not only has the Government of Nicaragua remained completely silent on the subject, but its highest leaders have also made threatening statements declaring that a war against Honduras is inevitable, in flagrant

violation of the fundamental principles recognized by the international legal community.

13. It is clear, then, that Nicaragua wants war, whereas Honduras wants peace. If that were not case, then one might ask how it is that our country is prepared to open up its territory without any restrictions to international supervision, provided that Nicaragua does likewise, especially in the border areas, ports, airports and other strategic zones. How else can one explain our constant willingness to enter into a dialogue? In addition there was a long talk with the Minister for External Relations of Nicaragua, Mr. Miguel D'Escoto Brockmann, last 8 October here at Headquarters, under the auspices of the Secretary-General.

14. Subsequently, spontaneously and forthrightly, in November I travelled to Managua bearing a message of peace and understanding from my Government to the people and Government and people of Nicaragua, a message that was radically censored in all that country's media by the Censorship Commission, which is under the Nicaraguan Government. I have here clear and affirmative proof, a copy of the newspaper *La Prensa* of that date, in which even a tiny notice about the arrival in Nicaragua of the Foreign Minister of Honduras on a good will mission of peace and harmony was censored. I should like to present further evidence of that fact. Here is a person who accompanied me during the press conference at the international airport in Managua and who heard my statement and our willingness to promote peace. He was witness to what I said, as well as to the fact that that conference was completely censored. I refer to the Deputy Minister for External Relations of Nicaragua, Mr. Victor Hugo Tinoco, who was seated at my side on that occasion. In spite of that brazenness, and in view of the continuous accusations that Honduras is harbouring forces opposed to the Nicaraguan régime in camps from which they supposedly attack Sandinist forces, in February of this year I issued a cordial invitation to Minister D'Escoto Brockmann to travel with me to the border area between both countries and see for himself that there are no such camps on Honduran territory, whose alleged existence led to an intensive and well-orchestrated publicity campaign to discredit my country, in Nicaragua's stubborn attempt to appear to be the victim, to change its role from killer to victim, to radicalize its conduct, to distract attention from the serious internal conflict besetting that country and to continue to enjoy reaping the benefits of international economic and military aid and handouts. I hardly need to say that the Government of Nicaragua declined similar offers.

15. Militarily, Honduras has also demonstrated its desire for serious and civilized dialogue. During the past year, first there was a meeting of senior military leaders of both countries at the Honduran customs post of La Fraternidad, presided over by the Chiefs of the General Staffs. A little while afterwards, in the Nicaraguan port of Corinto there was another meeting of the heads of the respective naval forces, with a subsequent meeting scheduled but never held, because of Nicaragua's reluctance to agree to machinery designed to prevent border incidents and to establish a climate of détente in Central America.

16. The Government of Nicaragua has still not replied to the invitation for that further meeting of naval chiefs to prevent maritime incidents. Last November I repeated this invitation personally to the Co-ordinator of the Governing Junta, Commander Daniel Ortega Saavedra, and he told me that meetings of that kind were unimportant.

17. It is truly regrettable that all these efforts by my country to bring about a better regional understanding have been fruitless and that relations between Central American States have become only more tense. While Honduras seeks the relaxation of tension and a dialogue with all the countries of the region, Nicaragua threatens us with imminent war. Here are statements by the highest leaders, who have stated that they are prepared to confront Honduras and to start an international war. In order to justify the massive mobilization of troops in the border area begun last Thursday, the Government of Nicaragua now publicly and directly accuses the armed forces of Honduras of having bombarded and, what is even more unusual, of having even invaded Nicaraguan territory, charges which my Government vigorously rejects as being completely unfounded and totally brazen.

18. My country's Government once again proclaims its complete neutrality in the internal conflicts afflicting neighbouring countries and its sincere interest that those fraternal peoples enjoy the precious gift of peace and democracy through dialogue, understanding and mutual respect. Our interest in these objectives is particularly great because, owing to our geographical proximity, internal conflicts tend to extend beyond borders and to affect normal development in our country. Proof of that is that Honduras recently took in nearly 40,000 refugees from Central American countries, especially Salvadorians and Nicaraguans. As the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees can attest, the number of Nicaraguans has increased alarmingly over the last few weeks. The presence of refugees in Honduras can be explained only by their awareness that the Honduran Government is remaining neutral in the struggles of their countries and is guaranteeing a climate of freedom, security and humanitarian understanding in face of the climate of uncertainty and violence that exists in thier respective countries. These are the only Nicaraguan camps which, although we did not seek their existence, exist on Honduran territory.

19. As the representative of a legitimate Government arising from the freely expressed majority will of the Honduran people, respectful of the law and of its international commitments, I formally denounce before the Council the unjustified acts of provocation and threats made by the Nicaraguan Government against Honduras, which constitute a real and serious danger to peace and security in the Central American region. Similarly, I

appeal to the Council to adopt specific measures so that, through dialogue and negotiation, a comprehensive regional solution to the Central American tragedy may be found, for the various factors at play are comprehensive and regional—the political turmoil, the rents in society, the economic contradictions and the violence that has been unleashed, all of which have thrown this region of the Latin American continent into a state of upheaval.

20. I repeat that the most fervent desire of the Government of Honduras is for peace to return to Central America, thus promoting an atmosphere in which public freedoms would flourish, the pluralistic democratic system would be strengthened and the dignity of the human person enhanced.

21. Mr. TINOCO (Nicaragua) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I shall address myself to a few central and basic points which I believe it important to highlight with regard to the statement just delivered by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Honduras, Mr. Edgardo Paz Barnica.

22. We believe that it is important to bring out precisely those aspects which were ignored in that statement. We wish to recall that, with regard to the oft-repeated invitation, supposedly ignored by Nicaragua, to visit the camps of counter-revolutionaries operating in Honduras—camps from which they have been infiltrating into Nicaragua since February—we have already clearly expounded our position at an earlier meeting of the Council. In this connection I think that the representative of Honduras could provide his Minister with the verbatim records containing our reply on this matter [*2420th meeting, paras. 128-129*].

23. With regard to the peace proposals of Honduras and its alleged efforts to help bring about peace, I should like to mention a number of steps taken by the Nicaraguan Government.

24. For example, I wish to draw the Council's attention to the fact that on 6 May 1981 the first step was taken by the Republic of Nicaragua, when my country's Government called for a meeting at the highest level in which would also participate the Ministers of Defence and the Chiefs of the General Staffs. This call was directed, in note No. 064 of 6 May, to the Government of Honduras, then headed by General Policarpo Paz García. In its note No. 178 of 11 May Honduras accepted Nicaragua's invitation. It was precisely as a result of that meeting that a series of agreements was reached, and since the beginning of May 1981—before the process of escalation of the activities of the counter-revolutionary camps in Honduras began and before the $20 million grant by the American Administration to help these bands was approved—we have been working with Honduras, trying to prevent that country's being transformed into a spring-board and, hence, an instrument for intervention against Nicaragua.

25. In November of that same year, a member of the Governing Junta, Mr. Rafael Córdova Rivas, went to Tegucigalpa—the first visit to Honduras by a member of the Governing Junta since the triumph of the Revolution, at a time when there had not yet been a visit at that level from Honduras to Nicaragua—and I accompanied him personally. We had talks with Colonel Elvir Sierra, then Foreign Minister. We reiterated to him that there was a need to implement everything that had been agreed upon in the Guasaule meeting in May of that year. We made a series of proposals with respect to joint patrolling of the borders with a view to preventing the installation of counter-revolutionary camps, which had only just begun at the time.

26. On 27 January 1982, as a display of political good will by Nicaragua towards Honduras, the Co-ordinator of the Governing Junta of National Reconstruction, Commander Daniel Ortega Saavedra, as Minister Paz Barnica just informed us, attended the ceremony of the assumption of power by the new President of Honduras, Mr. Roberto Suazo Córdova.

27. On 15 March our Foreign Minister, Mr. Miguel D'Escoto Brockmann, in note No. 108 invited the already appointed Foreign Minister of Honduras, Edgardo Paz Barnica, to hold a meeting between them at whatever date deemed convenient by Honduras, in order to reach a better understanding between our nations. On 19 March, Foreign Minister Paz Barnica sent note No. 185 DSM, dated 17 March, in which he said, "circumstances oblige me to be away from Honduras for the next few days, and when I return we shall by common agreement establish the dates for this meeting".

28. Since the Foreign Minister of Honduras had not yet come to Nicaragua, on 21 April it was decided that Foreign Minister D'Escoto Brockmann would go to Tegucigalpa, where he presented to the Honduran Government, through Foreign Minister Paz Barnica, a six-point proposal aimed at preventing erosion in relations between Nicaragua and Honduras. The six points were: first, to hold an immediate meeting of the army chiefs of both countries—a meeting which never took place, in spite of the willingness of the Government of Nicaragua; secondly, to sign a non-aggression agreement between our two countries; thirdly, to set up a joint border patrol; fourthly, to dismantle the Somozist counter-revolutionary camps; fifthly, to refrain from setting up any foreign naval base in the Gulf of Fonseca, where Honduran and Nicaraguan waters meet; and sixthly, to hold bilateral meetings of all kinds and, with the co-operation of international organizations, to repatriate the Miskitos who wished to return to Nicaragua.

29. On 20 May a meeting was held in La Fraternidad with Colonel José Abdenego Sueso Rosa, Chief of the General Staff of the Honduran armed forces. Unfortunately, however, nothing developed from that meeting. On 24 August, to continue this outline of what are perhaps the most relevant points in the Nicaraguan process of rapprochement with Honduras, in an effort to prevent Honduras from becoming a spring-board for counter-revolution—Foreign Minister D'Escoto Brockmann, completing the proposal of Commander Ortega

Saavedra, invited Foreign Minister Paz Barnica to meet with him at Managua on 1, 2 and 3 September, if convenient. On 1 September, Foreign Minister Paz Barnica, replying to that invitation, said that he could not accept it because he had "prior commitments". On 24 September Foreign Minister Paz Barnica was again invited to a meeting with the Nicaraguan Foreign Minister, and the Honduran Foreign Ministry issued the same excuses on 29 September. On 8 October the meeting between Foreign Minister Paz Barnica and Foreign Minister D'Escoto Brockmann was held, which is the meeting to which Mr. Paz Barnica referred. On 12 November Foreign Minister Paz Barnica, precisely in response to the earlier invitation made on all the dates I have just mentioned, decided to visit Nicaragua and met with Commander Ortega Saavedra, of the Governing Junta, and me.

30. On 19 February 1983—as I said earlier, this coincided with the mobilization of the counter-revolutionary camps already concentrated especially in the Las Trojes area, in the El Paraíso department of Honduras and in the Mosquito Coast area of Honduras—an invitation was issued, to which we replied that we considered it necessary to hold high-level meetings to determine how to carry out the inspection. Of course, the Council has been told that Nicaragua did not respond to that invitation, which is quite inaccurate.

31. I wanted to bring this to the attention of the Council in order to demonstrate that Nicaragua has been making an effort, not only to reach fraternal agreement with Honduras, but also to try and prevent Honduras from becoming a staging area for counter-revolutionary forces opposed to the Sandinist Government. This has been impossible to accomplish, however, because of the tremendous pressure and manipulation of the United States Government through a number of steps we are familiar with.

32. It is interesting to note that it has been glibly affirmed here that the present aggression against Nicaragua is an internal conflict, that what has been happening in Nicaragua is the result of an internal conflict between Nicaraguan Somozist forces and Sandinist forces.

33. It is a secret to no one, as I have already explained, that since early February 1982, when we began making efforts to prevent Honduras from stepping up its participation in the counter-revolution, there were at least 13 camps along the Honduran border. We said that beginning in December those camps began to mass troops at two strategic points in the Las Trojes and Mosquitia areas basically. It is precisely from those areas, which had already been centres of military activity, that Somozist gangs began to enter our country.

34. An attempt has been made here to deny the undeniable: that Honduran territory has been used for the activities of those counter-revolutionary forces, with the assent and under the direction of important sectors of the Honduran army and Government. We wish to support this thesis because we do not wish to foist all responsibility on the entire Honduran Government. Let us speak about specific facts.

35. The other day, the representative of Honduras said that they could not control all those thousands of kilometres of border; this can be read in the verbatim records [*ibid., para.64*]. I would remind the Council that we have only 700 kilometres of border between us. That is not the main point, though. There are areas along that 700-kilometre border where the population density is relatively high, with roads and means of communication that are systematically used by the counter-revolutionary forces. If the Government of Honduras had really wanted to control those gangs then it would have done so quite some time ago.

36. For example, from the first months of 1982 to the first months of 1983, these counter-revolutionary gangs have caused a total of 386 deaths, 284 wounded and 211 captured, mostly in the border area of our country. This is no mere invention of the Nicaraguan revolution. The family members, as reported in *The New York Times* of today, the widows of those Nicaraguans killed along the border can confirm this. During that period there were about 183 attacks along the border, 131 of which have been virtually right on the border line and other, more recent, ones a few kilometres inside the border. In which departments? Basically, in the Chinandega, Madriz, Nueva Segovia and Zelaya departments.

37. I was saying that if the Honduran authorities had wanted to control the Somozist gangs at all they could have done so. We are not talking about thousands of kilometres. Let us just take one area—the El Paraíso area, the Honduran department which borders on the Nicaraguan department of Nueva Segovia. Or let us take the Choluteca area that borders on the Nicaraguan Chinandega department. We are talking about a border area of not more than 70 kilometres in length, and what has happened there? There have been at least 36 attacks in this area of less than 70 kilometres, no fewer than 36 attacks by counter-revolutionary gangs at various levels. There was an attack on border guards at Santo Tomás del Nance, an attack on the bridges over the Negro River, where both bridges were blown up, an attack on the bridge over the Toronado River, an attack on Peña del Jicote, an attack on Las Mesas, an attack on La Guaruma, an attack on Rancho Los Encinos, an attack on La Esperanza, an attack on Valle de Las Torres, two attacks on Ranchón Bibijagua, two attacks on La Zopilota hill, two attacks on El Paraíso, two attacks on border guards at La Ceiba, two attacks on border guards at El Variador, four attacks on Loma Oscura, four attacks on Vado Ancho and five attacks on San Pedro del Norte. According to all elementary military logic the concentration of attacks in an area widely known for its counter-revolutionary activity would have enabled the Honduran Government or Honduran troops to have captured at least one Somozist, but they have not been able to do so. They have not had even one encounter with a counter-revolutionary force when operating throughout the period of these 36 attacks in a very small area of territory.

38. Let me give some other examples so that people will not go on saying that this is an internal conflict. This is the very position maintained by the United States Administration, which says, "There is an internal conflict in Nicaragua; there is an internal conflict in El Salvador; therefore things are the same. Let us negotiate them together." Let hope that that means that they will be willing to negotiate in El Salvador in the near future; that could be one explanation. But let us look at the Nueva Segovia area, which borders on the Honduran department of El Paraíso. What has happened there in the past 10 months? There have been 43 attacks from Honduran territory. We can mention some: an attack on Ojo de Agua, an attack on El Tablazo, an attack on La Ceiba, an attack on Cerro de Ayote, an attack on San José de las Manos, an attack on Teotecacinte, an attack on Loma de las Islas, an attack on Planes de Bilán, an attack on border guards at Zacateras, an attack on border guards at Playa Hermosa, an attack on border guards at Huanito, an attack on border guards at Rio Coco, an attack on border guards at Cerro Jesus and other attacks on border guards at El Porvenir, El Portillo, Mata de Plátano and Las Puertas. All of these attacks again took place in an area of less than 70 kilometres, again close to the border between Honduras and Nicaragua. Along the same 70 kilometres there have also been two attacks on El Suyital, two attacks on Los Arenales, two attacks on border guards at Los Planes, two attacks on troops at San Francisco, two attacks on Siuche and two attacks on Las Pampas.

39. It would be very difficult to try to deny reality. All the attacks I have just mentioned are only a few examples. They are not all the attacks that have occurred; they are just those which have taken place along the border area. We are not talking about any of the other attacks, which have taken place 15, 20 or 25 kilometres within Nicaraguan territory; we are speaking strictly about border attacks.

40. If this were an internal conflict, what would be the logic of the counter-revolutionary Somozist bands, if they are inside the country, to attack the border area, which is precisely where the Sandinist army is fortified, instead of attacking other areas within the country, which are less heavily guarded because the Sandinist forces are at the northern border? It would not be at all logical to think that counter-revolutionary bands within the country are going to go to the most heavily fortified points—in the north—to attack the frontier. The only explanation for this is that those bands have been trained, equipped and assembled and are attacking across this border, attacking the aforementioned military border posts all along the border between Honduras and Nicaragua. This is what is being termed an internal conflict, in an attempt to deny the undeniable. An attempt is being made to continue to deny what is generally recognized by the entire international community. Of course, the United States is sponsor and patron and is financing and developing this undeclared war against Nicaragua.

41. But we ask ourselves, what is the logic of the Honduran authorities? Why are they allowing their territory to be used for counter-revolutionary activities against Nicaragua? There were elections in 1982, and the new Government should not have allowed this. I should like to say that we really thought that the situation would change with the new Honduran Government, that the new civilian Government would adopt a somewhat more balanced position, that the forces in Honduras would not be as influential, and that common sense would prevail and there would be some sort of understanding promoted with Nicaragua.

42. Indeed, we must be clear on the fact that there have been two general trends in Honduras. A sector of Honduran society and of the Government—and the interesting thing is that this sector consists of private enterprise, which has business dealings with Nicaragua—has always tried to avoid a conflict with Nicaragua. But the military sectors, pressured by the American Administration especially since John Dimitri Negroponte was appointed ambassador, have begun to harass all those who supported the policy of détente with Nicaragua. But we hoped, after the 1982 elections, that the civilian sector, which was seeking détente, would prevail over the military sector, which was promoting a policy of confrontation with Nicaragua and support for the counter-revolutionary bands.

43. But this was not possible. Little by little, the aggressive, war-mongoring sector undermined the civilian pro-détente sector that exists—or existed, because I think it is less influential now—in Honduran society. There has been a series of attacks on those, even within the army, who wanted conciliation with Nicaragua. But what has happened is that instead of strengthening civilian power, it is precisely the military's power that has become stronger. The chief of the armed forces, Gustavo Alvarez, one of the most aggressive elements against Nicaragua, has been given all the power. He has assumed new military powers in Honduras and, together with Ambassador Negroponte, is directing all counter-revolutionary activities against Nicaragua. There have been sectors within the Honduran army who wanted détente with Nicaragua, and those sectors were excluded a few months after the election in the internal struggle between the sectors supporting peace and those supporting war. We have two very clear examples of this. The leaders of the conciliation movement within the Honduran army who sought coexistence with Nicaragua were expelled from Honduras, for all practical intents and purposes. Let us take the case of Colonel Hubber Bodden, for example, who had been head of Honduran intelligence. Colonel Alvarez, supported by the American Embassy, sent him as a military attaché to Argentina, which was to send him very far away, especially at the time when Argentina did not have active relations with Central America. And what happened to the other leader in the Honduran army who wanted a conciliation with Nicaragua, Colonel Leónidas Torres Arias? He also was sent by Gustavo Alvarez and the American Embassy to the other side of the Earth to Taiwan. This gives some idea of why Nicaragua has tried to follow the internal strife in Honduras, because of the role Honduras is going to play

against Nicaragua. However, unfortunately, it is obvious that the most aggressive side seems to be holding sway now; hence these counter-revolutionary bands and Honduras' complicity with the American Administration.

44. Perhaps the representative of Honduras did not give to his Foreign Minister the article that appeared in *The New York Times* of today about counter-revolutionary camps in Honduras, which the author had the opportunity of seeing. The article is by Stephen Kinzer, an American reporter in Honduras who went to the counter-revolutionary camp where they told him that some of them had been infiltrating Nicaragua with the support of certain Honduran officials. But all of this is a lie, according to the American Administration. And, according to the American Administration, this is an internal conflict and is not particularly relevant. But the American representatives here have not said anything about another article that appeared in *The New York Times* by Saul Landau, where he says that on 19 November 1981, William J. Casey, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), went to the House Select Committee on Intelligence to talk about the $20 million plan that was being developed. The American Administration claims that this too is a lie and that all the American congressmen criticizing this destabilization plan and these funds allocated to destabilizing Nicaragua are paranoid. All congressmen, Republicans and Democrats—I will not mention any names, for they are known to everyone here—who are in opposition are seeing things, and no such plan of aggression against Nicaragua exists, according to the American Administration.

45. It should also be recalled, and I repeat, that the American delegation in the Council has not deigned to answer the three concrete questions put to it which might help the Council to assess American responsibility in this matter. The three questions to which there have been no replies are: is the CIA linked to the counter-revolutionary forces which are operating against Nicaragua? Has official money from the American Government been approved for anti-Nicaragua activities in the sum of $20 million? Are there counter-revolutionary training camps in the United States, or are there not? These are three concrete questions which have not yet been replied to; this lack of response reveals the level of interference by the American Administration, the nearly public acceptance of its war against Nicaragua. We think it has been important to denounce these facts in the Council because we cannot allow these flagrant efforts to destabilize the sovereign Government of Nicaragua to pass unnoticed.

46. Finally, and in a more constructive vein, I wish to state what the position of Nicaragua is, to see whether it is still possible to find some way out, or a formula of understanding, not as a result of any effort by the American Government, but by pressure that may be put on that Government. I have received from Managua express instructions to propose to the delegation of Honduras and to Foreign Minister Paz Barnica of Honduras the following: that there be a presidential meeting between the President of Honduras, Mr. Suazo Córdova, and Commander Ortega Saavedra, the Co-ordinator of the Governing Junta—preferably in the presence of the Presidents of Mexico and Venezuela, who would testify to the good faith and the positions of the parties—to discuss relations between Nicaragua and Honduras in any place to be chosen by the Government of Honduras in Mexico or in Venezuela at the earliest possible date, to be decided on by Honduras. This is an official proposal that we make in the Council to the Government of Honduras for a meeting between President Suazo Córdova and Commander Ortega Saavedra at a time and place suitable to Honduras to begin discussions on the relations between our two countries.

47. As regards the United States Government, a decisive factor in the Central American crisis and in the aggression—not just the determining factor but the propelling factor and instigator of aggression against Nicaragua—we would propose that we immediately begin direct and frank talks in a third country to be chosen by common consent. It could be in any country that has on past occasions shown a willingness to serve as a venue for meetings between Nicaragua and the United States; it could be in France, Spain, Mexico, Venezuela or Panama, in order to discuss the relations and difficulties between our two countries.

48. Those are two concrete proposals.

49. Mr. AMEGA (Togo) (*interpretation from French*): At a time when the report of the Secretary-General on the work of the Organization[1] is being considered, facts brought to the attention of the Council by various speakers following Nicaragua's presentation of its case have concretely demonstrated the refusal of States to respect the principles of the Charter to which they have subscribed, thus confirming one of the observations of the Secretary-General, who wrote:

> "I sometimes feel that we now take the Charter far less seriously than did its authors, living as they did in the wake of a world tragedy. I believe therefore that an important first step would be a conscious recommitment by Governments to the Charter."[2]

50. Is it necessary to remind anyone that we the peoples of the United Nations have declared our determination to "save succeeding generations from the scourge of war", to "reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small", and for these ends we have also resolved to "practice tolerance and to live together in peace with one another as good neighbours, and to unite our strength to maintain international peace and security"? Can we ever tire of repeating that all States Members of the Organization are bound to respect those affirmations of the Preamble to the Charter and to act in accordance with the principles that derive from it, that is, the sovereign equality of all Members, the settlement of international disputes by peaceful means and the non-use of force or

the threat of force against the territorial integrity and political independence of any State or in any other way incompatible with the purposes of the United Nations?

51. In a world teeming with crises, particularly those that are engulfing Central America, given the grave problems confronting Nicaragua, and after having heard the different statements made in this Council, my delegation must face up to a grim truth: that the law of the jungle still reigns supreme in international relations. Justice, law, equity and tolerance have been pilloried. The Council has in the course of its meetings on this matter been made only too aware of acts of violence, murders and massive violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms, and it has received information with regard to intent to commit aggression and to cause destabilization.

52. These different factors, which are germs of conflagration and hotbeds of tension, can be analysed only in terms of survival of the States of the region which, feeling that their sovereignty is threatened, have taken certain measures to safeguard that sovereignty. Those measures often take the form of signing agreements and pacts with friendly countries ready to provide them with the military material necessary for the defence of that sovereignty. Thus are forged alliances which, far from contributing to the improvement of existing situations, serve only to maintain them if not to worsen them and thus fuel the fires of confrontation between the blocs that are the sources of these alliances. The factors of tension will disappear once the threats of aggression and the violations of fundamental rights are brought to a halt and guarantees of independence and peace are given to all sides, and once all the States of the area concerned are willing to respect the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and each State has the freedom to exercise its sovereign rights and freely to choose the new social and political experiments desired by its people. It is precisely in this spirit that the principles of the Charter were conceived.

53. The delegation of Togo was happy to welcome the statements of the parties with regard to their willingness to enter into negotiations to guarantee peace and security in the region. Thus the parties concerned are clearly aware of their obligations under the Charter, especially in its Article 33, which states that:

> "The parties to any dispute, the continuation of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, shall, first of all, seek a solution by negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or agreements, or other peaceful means of their own choice."

It is also the task of the Council to propose to the parties appropriate measures for the bringing about of a settlement of the current conflict.

54. However, we cannot overlook the existence of the mediation initiatives of Mexico and other States of the area to bring about negotiations. Within this context my delegation wishes to stress its wholehearted appreciation of the attempts made so far to settle this crisis. We wish warmly to encourage those initiatives and express the hope that the parties will evince all the necessary good will in the negotiations. It is important that the countries concerned should embark upon dialogue with a view to adopting practical measures to guarantee the peace the region needs.

55. As I said last year in this very place:

> "The people of Togo ardently wishes peace . . . for itself and for all nations. That peace must be real and must contribute to the effective emancipation of our different nations. That is why, faced with the disarray in our world which threatens the international equilibrium, Togo has always advocated recourse to fraternal dialogue and permanent consultation in seeking in peace just solutions for the tragic conflicts shaking our world" [*2339th meeting, para. 63*].

56. It is such a dialogue that my delegation once again invites all States concerned in the conflict now being considered by the Council to undertake. That dialogue would be proof that the Organization to which we all belong, and of which the Security Council is the peace-keeping organ, can preserve its raison d'être and deserve the gratitude of future generations.

The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.

NOTES

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-seventh Session, Supplement No. 1* (A/37/1).

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 1.

Litho in United Nations, New York 00300 60205—July 1990—2,050

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم . استعلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب إلى : الأمم المتحدة ، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف .

如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.

Litho in United Nations, New York 00400 60205—July 1990—2,050

UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-EIGHTH YEAR

2425th MEETING: 28 MARCH 1983

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2425)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
Letter dated 22 March 1983 from the Deputy Minister for External Relations of Nicaragua addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15651)	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/ . . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

2425th MEETING

Held in New York on Monday, 28 March 1983, at 3.30 p.m.

President: Sir John THOMSON (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland).

Present: The representatives of the following States: China, France, Guyana, Jordan, Malta, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Poland, Togo, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire, Zimbabwe.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2425)

1. Adoption of the agenda.

2. Letter dated 22 March 1983 from the Deputy Minister for External Relations of Nicaragua addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15651).

The meeting was called to order at 4.25 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Letter dated 22 March 1983 from the Deputy Minister for External Relations of Nicaragua addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15651)

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decisions taken at previous meetings on this item [*2420th to 2424th meetings*], I invite the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Honduras to take a place at the Security Council table. I invite the representatives of Algeria, Argentina, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, the German Democratic Republic, the Federal Republic of Germany, Ecuador, Grenada, India, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Italy, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Panama, Peru, the Philippines, Spain, the Syrian Arab Republic, the United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam and Yugoslavia to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Ortez Colindres (Honduras) took a place at the Council table. Mr. Abada (Algeria), Mr. Muñiz (Argentina), Mr. Moseley (Barbados), Miss Dever (Belgium), Mr. Salazar Paredes (Bolivia), Mr. Bueno (Brazil), Mr. Tsvetkov (Bulgaria), Mr. Sanz de Santamaría (Colombia), Mr. Zumbado Jiménez (Costa Rica), Mr. Roa Kourí (Cuba), Mr. Al-Alfi (Democratic Yemen), Mr. Knipping Victoria (Dominican Republic), Mr. Albornoz (Ecuador), Mr. Chávez-Mena (El Salvador), Mr. Ott (German Democratic Republic), Mr. van Well (Federal Republic of Germany), Mr. Taylor (Grenada), Mr. Purushottam (India), Mr. Serajzadeh (Islamic Republic of Iran), Mr. La Rocca (Italy), Mr. Treiki (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Mr. Maudave (Mauritius), Mr. Muñoz Ledo (Mexico), Mr. Narkhuu (Mongolia), Mr. Ozores Typaldos (Panama), Mr. Pastor de la Torre (Peru), Mr. Arcilla (Philippines), Mr. de Piniés (Spain), Mr. El-Fattal (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. Rupia (United Republic of Tanzania), Mrs. Coronel de Rodríguez (Venezuela) Mr. Hoang Bich Son (Viet Nam) and Mr. Silović (Yugoslavia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

2. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Cyprus, Czechoslovakia and Hungary in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Mou[illegible]outas (Cyprus), Mr. Suja (Czechoslovakia) and Mr. Ra[illegible] (Hungary) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

3. The PRESIDENT: The first speaker this afternoon is the Minister for Foreign Affairs of El Salvador, Mr. Fidel Chávez-Mena. I welcome him and invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

4. Mr. CHÁVEZ-MENA (El Salvador) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I wish to thank the members of the Security Council for allowing me to address the Council during the discussion now under way.

5. Respectful as it has been and is of the principle of non-intervention, my country has not interfered and does not interfere in the internal affairs of other States. If that is our behaviour on the international level, it is equally true at the regional level, on which we have indissoluble ties of geography, history and culture, as was proclaimed by the leaders of an independence that we obtained on the same day, after struggling against

the same colonizer. That is why a great deal of what I am about to say is extremely distressing to us.

6. Everyone is aware that at the present time two ideological trends are vying with each other to establish themselves in Central America. Those two trends are expressed in diametrically opposed behaviour. If they continue, those two attitudes cannot but hinder the elimination or reduction of tension. They are as different as water and oil, or the wolf and the lamb.

7. The recent introduction of political interests alien to Central America, derived from larger-scale confrontations, perpetuates the problems of the countries of our region, making them play the game—apparently unconsciously—of the merchants of war.

8. If we are to be successful in formulating ideas that will lead to harmony based on trust and co-operation, on common origins, on shared geography and destiny, then all people of good will must zealously embark on a search for peace, and others must co-operate with us in our efforts. The presence of both elements is essential, because if there is good will on the one hand and attempts to frustrate our efforts on the other, then in the end there will exist a situation in no way differing from what I have just described: water and oil, the wolf and the lamb.

9. It is a universally acknowledged fact that there is a situation of widespread conflict in Central America. That situation is generating new tensions and fostering other tensions whose origins date far back into the past. This situation makes it extremely difficult, if not impossible, for any political plans to be viable and stable, regardless of their nature.

10. In this connection I reiterate that the existence of different political programmes designed to overcome the conditions caused by social, political and economic underdevelopment produces tension and conflicts when one trend tries to impose itself on the others in the futile belief that they are exclusive approaches.

11. It is clear that the Central American situation is not free from the major disorders of the international monetary system, high rates of unemployment, excessive protectionism and the whole long series of negative symptoms the Central American subregion must face while it is in the very midst of its own social and political crisis.

12. The world has witnessed the fact that El Salvador, a country that belongs to a region in conflict, as Central America now is, has in its international relations acted with the greatest respect for the principles of non-intervention and self-determination. In a word, we have acted with the greatest of prudence.

13. That prudence has not been recompensed, given the accumulation of evidence that the Nicaraguan Government has been one of the primary factors of instability in Central America.

14. El Salvador has never intervened in the internal affairs of the other States of Central America, nor has it ever interfered in the internal affairs of Nicaragua. Consequently we are in a moral position to demand similar conduct on the part of the other countries of Central America.

15. El Salvador has been the victim of—among other belligerent and hostile acts—the continued transfer of weapons, the last link in the chain being our neighbour Republic of Nicaragua, which acts under the aegis of a misunderstood international solidarity and does not practise, and respects even less, the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of Central American States. As we all know, that principle includes not only one State's individual relations with another but also its relationships with various States and even international organizations themselves.

16. Everyone is aware that the armed groups operating in El Salvador have their central headquarters in Nicaragua. It is there that decisions are made and logistic support is channelled—logistic support without which it would be impossible for them to continue in their struggle and without which they would have joined in the democratic process.

17. Fortunately for the valiant and persevering people of Central America, and the Salvadorans in particular, neither the collusion of countries nor international trends can bend their will of iron, since they only want peace, but peace obtained through democratic channels, not through the fragility of a Government that wishes to impose itself without the support of the people, and surreptitiously.

18. If the principle of non-intervention is the cardinal norm of international law, it is strengthened by the relations of friendship and co-operation among States already developed by the United Nations. We believe it relevant to refer to General Assembly resolution 2131 (XX), entitled "Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of Their Independence and Sovereignty", because we consider that text to be particularly relevant to the present circumstances in Central America. In its operative part it clearly states:

> "No State has the right to intervene, directly or indirectly, for any reason whatever, in the internal or external affairs of any other State. Consequently, armed intervention and all other forms of interference or attempted threats against the personality of the State or against its political, economic and cultural elements, are condemned.
>
> ". . . no State shall organize, assist, foment, finance, incite or tolerate subversive, terrorist or armed activities directed towards the violent overthrow of the régime of another State, or interfere in civil strife in another State.
>
> ". . .

"The strict observance of these obligations is an essential condition to ensure that nations live together in peace with one another, since the practice of any form of intervention not only violates the spirit and letter of the Charter of the United Nations but also leads to the creation of situations which threaten international peace and security.

"Every State has an inalienable right to choose its political, economic, social and cultural systems, without interference in any form by another State.

"All States shall respect the right of self-determination and independence of peoples and nations, to be freely exercised without any foreign pressure, and with absolute respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms."

The clarity of those concepts requires no further comment, but we have quoted paragraphs of the resolution *in extenso* because they are very enlightening with regard to the problem of Central America and the situation that is now confronting the countries there.

19. No observer of the international scene can be unaware that the situation in Central America does not bode well for stability, much less for reasonable improvement. Everything seems to indicate that Central America is becoming a region of serious tensions from which wider confrontations could easily arise. For, taking advantage of prevailing instability and unjust economic and social structures, foreign interests are cultivating and directing the action of ideological groups in favour of their own particular military political positions.

20. In this context, it is logical to suppose that the expansionist designs of a Power outside the region should consider Central America and the Caribbean basin as a zone of "vital expansion" and as a bridgehead in America. Its hegemonistic and expansionist objectives are favoured by two ideologically loyal parties, Cuba and the Government of Nicaragua. This makes more acute, in a notable way, the presence on Central American soil of the different forms of struggle in the so-called East-West confrontation; it tends to regionalize or internationalize the conflict and makes its solution depend, unfortunately, on decisions taken by Governments or groups alien to the life of our own countries.

21. At the appropriate time El Salvador will assert the right recognized by the Charter of the United Nations itself with regard to regional competence—in this case, of the inter-American system—which, by political logic, must take preference in conflicts among States in the region. Our country has not deemed it prudent to resort to this measure for the time being in order to maintain some calm in a turbulent region and thus avoid an aggravation of the situation, through diplomacy and in the perhaps vain hope that the leaders of Nicaragua will understand that every country must resolve its own problems through the political system each people voluntarily chooses. Wisdom resides in tolerance for the systems of others—not in the clandestine export of arms, not in logistic support and not in the provision of sanctuaries for military training. There can be no double standard or scale of values in this respect. The principle of non-interference is a unity, without exceptions or equivocations. If we do not all accept that commitment, not only out of conviction but also because it is suitable, there will be no peace in Central America.

22. We have stated that we do not wish to see Central America become the object of a dispute in a conflict between the super-Powers in their zeal to acquire new zones of influence for their respective hegemonies, nor do we wish to see that process become divisive in an attempt to establish a political model that does not respond to the aspirations and traditions of those peoples, who are eminently Catholic, especially when that model is based on other cultural realities.

23. How can such an extraneous process fail to cause deep social unrest, such as we are observing in Nicaragua? If that occurs inside a country, international tensions heighten when that indistinct model is exported through words and deeds in propaganda and subversion that foment class struggle and magnify the social and economic imbalances that lie at the root of the political problems in Central America but which also exist in other parts of our world.

24. Neither a violent and merciless revolution inspired by nihilism, one that attempts to destroy the national infrastructure and creates unemployment and poverty, nor the maintenance of an unjust *status quo*, can be a true solution in Central America. We therefore firmly reject any attempt to establish through violent means a political system that represents an abandonment of ideological pluralism. This repudiation is consistent with the firm wish of the overwhelming majority of the people of Central America, who abhor the imposition, through force, of alien and dependent models. Precisely owing to that rejection, the path of elections is fundamental to the political solution and opens wide a door for massive and democratic participation by the peoples of Central America. Thus far, in the practice of political science no better method has been invented to reflect the national will. All of this must, of course, be accomplished with the necessary electoral guarantees.

25. We also wish to state that where the freedoms of citizens are concerned, bragging about non-alignment without ideological pluralism internally has no practical meaning and becomes only another tool for totalitarian and anti-democratic propaganda.

26. We must not confuse the full exercise of territorial sovereignty with attitudes that create conflicts by promoting distrust. I am referring to the acquisition of military arsenals that are disproportionate to the needs of national security or regional balance and its true economic capabilities. Is that unbridled arms race not a provocation for neighbours, especially when the exportation of new social schemes to neighbouring States becomes national policy? Is this not an invitation to the arms race? Is it not an element that contributes to regional tension? Is it not a factor that destabilizes the peace of the region in an already turbulent situation?

42

27. The answer is clearly affirmative. It is high time that in this play-acting—in what is of course, owing to the death and desolation it is creating, a tragedy—that the masks were dropped and that those who today in international forums are posing as victims stood revealed as the victimizers.

28. Our highest aspiration and most fervent desire as a Central American people facing the difficult challenge of mindless gun-fire and the insanity of attacks is for peace in the region. We do not want to see an increase in tension; therefore, we must make every honest and sincere effort possible to achieve political stability, economic development and social peace in Central America.

29. This is not a new position. On the contrary, it is in line with age-old tradition, a long line of conduct that has always been marked by peace. At the meeting of Foreign Ministers at San José, Costa Rica, on 15 March 1980, in which the five Republics of Central America participated, we affirmed the highest Central American aspirations for peace, mutual respect, peaceful coexistence, the right to self-determination and, especially, the recognition of the absolute and unfettered observance of the principles of non-interference in the internal affairs of other States as vital requirements for the establishment of peace and security in the region. That was reiterated at the meeting of Central American Foreign Ministers at Tegucigalpa on 15 August 1981.

30. Until peaceful coexistence prevails, until there is respect for the principles of the self-determination of peoples and non-interference in the internal affairs of other States, until petty foreign interests cease to guide the conduct of any country in the region, development, justice and peace will remain unattainable ideals.

31. Thus I do not hesitate in offering all my good will to obtain that peace—a prerequisite if those other values are to be attained.

32. To that end it is essential that all Central American countries adopt consistent policies for the limitation of arms and military troops; that we completely refrain from arms trafficking; and that we do not accept provocation or harassment from outside, because we all have a right to organize ourselves at the social, economic and political levels in the way in which each of our peoples freely decides through its own sovereign will.

33. It is essential, therefore, that each and every one of our Central American Governments, representing each and every one of our peoples, undertake an urgent search for a viable and adequate solution. And the first step is that we sit down face to face, without exclusion and without conditions, to discuss, speak and analyse. In the mean time, let the cannons and guns cease their fire and let the limited resources available to us not be wasted on a useless and shameful arms race.

34. El Salvador reaffirms its democratic and peaceful calling. Without any rancour or desire for revenge as the brothers we are, we publicly invite all the Central American countries, including Nicaragua, to meet to discuss logically, in a civilized manner, the best possible way of putting an end to tensions in our region.

35. Thus, on the basis of the principle of non-interference and the concept and nature of the Central American nation, it is essential that the Central Americans alone, exclusively, resolve the problems of the region. Therefore, no one—absolutely no one—under any pretext should interfere in the regional problems of Central America, which are essentially and basically the responsibility of Central Americans. In this connection, we reject any formulas or proposals, regardless of their intention, from outside the Central American region, since we have the political maturity and awareness of the historic responsibility required in order within a regional dialogue, without any exception, I repeat, to seek the peace and political, social and economic stability of the region.

36. That meeting of Central American countries should be inspired by good faith, by an honest desire to resolve the problems that cause tension and by a renunciation of any aggressive or meddling attitude in the affairs of other States. That gathering of the Governments of Central America, which we have promoted together with the Republics of Honduras and Costa Rica, should, in our view, include the discussion and analysis of the following points: first, limitations on the arms race; secondly, safeguards with a view to eliminating the traffic in weapons from the Central American region; thirdly, the strengthening of trade and economic relations among the countries of the region; and, fourthly, the strengthening of the region's democratic, pluralist and participatory institutions.

37. We hope that the international community will accept and welcome this peace initiative being expressed here with the best of intentions.

38. My appeal is for the establishment of democracy, the complete observance of human rights, social justice, tolerance and fraternal feelings among all the peoples of Central America. And it is for peace—for peace the victories of which are more difficult to achieve and, for that very reason, more desirable than the victories of war.

39. Mr. NATORF (Poland): First of all I should like to extend to you, Sir, the congratulations of my delegation on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council. Your competence and skill assure us of good leadership in dealing with the Council's business this month. We have already witnessed that. It is also with satisfaction that I take this opportunity to convey to your predecessor, Mr. Oleg Troyanovsky of the Soviet Union, our appreciation for the skill, objectivity and personal charm with which he conducted the Council's work last month.

40. The Council continues its consideration of the serious increase of tensions in Central America caused by open interference in the internal affairs of Nicaragua. That interference is evidently threatening peace and stability in the region and, consequently, in the world at

large. That is why the Council as a whole should not remain indifferent to it.

41. My delegation has listened with particular interest and attention to the statements made before the Council by Mr. Victor Hugo Tinoco, the Deputy Minister for External Relations of Nicaragua, including the one this morning [*2424th meeting*]. He described in detail the situation in and around his country. There is no doubt that the Nicaraguan Government's request for an urgent meeting of the Council was fully justified.

42. Both the content of Mr. Tinoco's statements and the facts widely publicized by the mass media prove that the Government and people of Nicaragua are facing a new aggressive escalation of actions aimed at the destabilization of the life and economy of that country. This sinister escalation is reflected in repeated subversive and terrorist activities, hostile external propaganda, acts of intimidation by the United States Administration and, most recently, the massive infiltration of foreign trained mercenaries from the territory of Honduras. Today *The New York Times* reveals new facts about the real involvement of Honduras in a master plan aimed against Nicaragua. A real army of paramilitary forces has been recruited abroad from ex-Somoza guards and is now being used in sabotage raids against agricultural, industrial and other important targets in Nicaragua. Simple common sense is sufficient to confirm that those activities and the groups conducting them can exist only to the extent that they are financed, trained and supported by external forces interested in overthrowing the legal Government of Nicaragua.

43. The aggressive escalation of hostile acts against Nicaragua is taking place when its Government of National Reconstruction has embarked upon the road of ridding its country of the legacy of economic underdevelopment, poverty, illiteracy, unemployment, social injustice and destruction. It is an irony that former friends and sponsors of Somoza's tyranny are now supporting his ex-followers under banners of lofty slogans of democracy, liberty and human rights. It seems to me that there should be limits to everything, even hypocrisy.

44. A large-scale propaganda campaign against Nicaragua has been escalated and reflected in numerous high-level pronouncements by a number of United States officials. This proves that there is tension in relations between the United States and Nicaragua which affects the security of Central America, and it is not tiny Nicaragua which poses a threat to the security of the United States.

45. I cannot but remark bitterly at this particular moment. Instead of replying to the facts and proof of aggression against Nicaragua, the representative of the United States in both her statements [*2420th and 2423rd meetings*] indulged in highly propagandistic and rhetorical accusations against Nicaragua's domestic policies. We interpret this as clear-cut interference in the internal affairs of that country, an action which, by the way, is not unfamiliar to us. There were some references made by her to the alleged proliferation of various "strange rights" in the present world. Indeed, what we very often are witnessing is the United States Administration's efforts to usurp to itself a strange right to be the supreme moral judge of every Government's conduct, of every system and of every country. The facts of the not-so-remote past, very well known to the entire world, do not give the United States moral authority to lecture others on morality. Such pretensions, mixing unilateral, dubious—in our view—moral absolutes and diplomacy, contribute only to aggravating the international climate and worsening of relations.

46. When we listened to the statement of the representative of the United States, we had the feeling that it was intended essentially to prove two things: first, that the Nicaraguan system and Government was an extremely weak one, full of internal illnesses and incapable of assuring the development of the nation—in fact, that the country was almost falling to pieces; and secondly, that Nicaragua posed a grave danger to the security of the whole Central American region and was capable of destabilizing all the Central American nations. Simple logic points to the fact that both assertions are inconsistent with each other; what is more, they are self-contradictory: the first excludes the second, and vice versa. So at least one assertion was wrong. As far as we are concerned, both of them are false.

47. My country, although located far from Central America, cannot remain indifferent to threats to peace and international security, wherever they occur. In the Political Declaration of the States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty of 5 January 1983, Poland joined the call to put a halt to "the policy of constant threats and provocations aimed against Cuba and Nicaragua and to all attempts at external interference in their internal affairs" [*see S/15556, annex, sect. IV*]. This reflects also our policy of friendship and co-operation with the Government of the peaceful Sandinist revolution in Nicaragua. We welcome the call upon the Government of the United States to "adopt a constructive position in favour of peace and dialogue with Nicaragua, and in order to help achieve political and negotiated solutions to the problems of the region" [*see S/15628, annex, para. 28*], as contained in the final communiqué of the Extraordinary Ministerial Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Countries held at Managua from 10 to 14 January 1983. This coincides fully with Mr. Tinoco's appeal to the United States on Wednesday [*2420th meeting*] to cease its aggressive stance against Nicaragua and to reconsider all peace initiatives.

48. My delegation takes note with satisfaction of the fact that the Nicaraguan Government endorses the peace initiative presented by Mexico and Venezuela in which the Presidents of those countries expressed their readiness to promote a dialogue between Nicaragua and Honduras that would facilitate understanding. We took note also that the non-aligned countries appealed to Honduras to reciprocate this gesture.

49. The question before us should be considered with all the attention its gravity calls for. The independence and territorial integrity of Nicaragua should be effectively protected by the Organization. This Central American country, as well as other nations of the region, should be allowed to enjoy fully its sovereign right to determine its system without any external interference, as set out in respective United Nations documents. The Council should not remain indifferent to the Nicaraguan call for help in developing a Central American policy conducive to peaceful, negotiated solutions. The threats and acts of aggression against Nicaragua should be denounced. Careful consideration should be given to Nicaraguan and non-aligned peace initiatives. There are many mechanisms for a peaceful settlement of disputes to be freely chosen by the States concerned. Action by the Council along these lines would contribute to its effective discharge of its primary responsibility as enshrined in the Charter.

50. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Algeria. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

51. Mr. ABADA (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): Thank you, Mr. President, for having allowed me to take part in this debate. I should like first of all to extend to you, Sir, the congratulations of the Algerian delegation on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council. We are convinced that your experience and broad knowledge of international affairs are an earnest of the quality of your contribution to the work of the Council. Our congratulations go also to your predecessor, Mr. Troyanovsky, who, with his customary skill, discharged that same responsibility during the month of February.

52. A year ago, almost to the day, the Security Council, at the request of Nicaragua, took up the serious situation affecting the entire region of Central America, and more specifically Nicaragua, whose sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity and the very choice of its own political, economic and social system were being threatened. A large number of countries, in particular those in the non-aligned group, expressed their serious concern over the danger of such a situation for Nicaragua itself and for the entire region. Like many other delegations, the Algerian delegation forcefully stressed the desire to see the Council, which was quite rightly seized of the situation to prevent the irreparable from happening, use its authority and assume its responsibilities to preserve international peace and security.

53. That concern and that awareness of the dangers expressed by a broad sector, and given added strength within the Council itself by a significant majority, unfortunately came to naught. Today's debate reflects that failure and in fact points to the worsening of the situation, because the persistence of this same conflict situation means that the peoples concerned continue to be diverted from their overriding legitimate task of reconstruction and development and are pitted against each other to the benefit of interests alien to them.

54. The question before the Council is part of the crisis disrupting many countries in the region of Central America and points to the long struggle of the peoples of the region fully to assume their destiny in dignity, freedom and independence, free of foreign interference.

55. In this difficult path, Nicaragua constitutes an outstanding example of the ability of a people to reverse the tragic course of its history, to regain its usurped freedom, to affirm, in the face of the regal rights of an oligarchy, its rights and to wage a true struggle, which we are all seeking to wage, against poverty and inequality. Far from being a danger to anyone, the Sandinist revolution has been perceived in its true meaning: the ultimate rehabilitation of peoples through the triumph of freedom and justice over oppression and repression.

56. It is this exemplary nature which has won for the Sandinist revolution deep sympathy and broad support throughout the world and which, within the United Nations itself, has been most meaningfully expressed when, scarcely a few months ago, a majority of Member States designated Nicaragua to sit on the Security Council. Over and beyond the natural expression of their solidarity towards Nicaragua, many Member States wished to show their full appreciation of the maturity of the Sandinist revolution and the responsible nature of its leaders.

57. For its part the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, upon the victory of the democratic forces, was happy to welcome Nicaragua to its ranks, aware of the eminent contribution that would make. And it was precisely at Managua that the Non-Aligned Movement convened an extraordinary meeting of its Co-ordinating Bureau in January to take up the problems of Latin America and to express the Movement's solidarity with the struggle of the peoples of that continent. At that meeting, as at the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi scarcely two weeks ago, from 7 to 12 March, the non-aligned countries clearly stated their concern at the threats to Nicaragua. The Movement's Co-ordinating Bureau was requested—and I quote from the final communiqué from Managua—to "continue observing the events in this subregion very closely, especially the acts of aggression against Nicaragua, and take appropriate action as called for by the situation" [*see S/15628, annex, para. 41*].

58. Aware of the repercussions of that situation on the future of the peoples of the region and, first and foremost, out of the desire to establish genuine, lasting peace—that is, to the real benefit of these peoples—the Movement welcomed and encouraged the peace initiatives put forward by many countries, notably Colombia, Mexico, Panama and Venezuela, as regards the problem of concern to us today. Algeria shares the fraternal concern of those countries and supports their initiatives, which, in the clear interests of all the peoples of the region, promote a peaceful search for a solution of the conflict.

59. In this process, which will certainly help stave off the dangers of confrontation, Algeria voices the hope that the Security Council will exert its full authority and thus deter all aggressive and destabilizing attempts of which Nicaragua is a victim. It wishes also to assure that friendly country of its full solidarity in the struggle for the consolidation of its independence, the preservation of its territorial integrity and the defence of its revolution.

60. Mr. TINOCO (Nicaragua) (*interpretation from Spanish*): With respect to statements in the debate on the possibilities of arriving at specific ways to alleviate existing regional tension and bilateral problems and the reference to the arms buildup of Nicaragua reiterated at this afternoon's meeting, the delegation of my country would like to point out that we have already made it clear that, for the defence measures taken by a nation to be qualified as excessive, the nature and the dimensions of the aggression or the threat it is facing must first be identified and described.

61. The identification and description of the threat confronting the Sandinist revolution must be undertaken in the light of the attitude and actions of the United States Administration towards Nicaragua and in the light of the attitude of the countries of the region—specifically, that of the Governments of Honduras and El Salvador.

62. In this connection I shall give but one example. Just a few weeks ago the Minister of Defence of El Salvador, General Guillermo García, in an open and public statement made in San Salvador, called on all the army heads of Central America—and, more specifically, of Honduras and Guatemala—to form a military alliance to go on the offence against Nicaragua. Subsequently, an attempt was made to deny that statement of the Defence Minister and strong man of El Salvador through an official communiqué issued by the El Salvador Ministry for Foreign Affairs. Nevertheless, the next day that same man, Mr. Guillermo García, said that there had been no mistake and that he had really been calling for an alliance, for the formation of a military triangle—the so-called triangle of the North—between the armies of Honduras, El Salvador and Guatemala against the Nicaraguan revolution.

63. I wanted to give that example so that there could be some understanding of the complexity of the situation in Central America and how difficult it would be to define the character and the extent of the threat against Nicaragua and, hence, the levels of defence to which the people of Nicaragua is entitled.

64. Moreover, speaking of the problem of negotiation and trying to go in depth into the steps that have been proposed, a representative who spoke before me already said that there was need for trust in order to enter into a negotiating process. It would be difficult to say that there is a high level of trust among the Central American countries, basically among the four countries of northern Central America.

65. In view of this situation, we believe that it is logical and elementary, if there is really a wish for progress in the negotiating process, to count on the presence of friendly countries that would play the role of witnesses to this declared good will to negotiate. That is why the delegation and Government of Nicaragua have always considered it fundamental to have witnesses in any process of negotiation with the Central American parties and in talks with the United States, precisely because after talks or a meeting when only the two parties in dispute have been present in a given place it is easy for everyone coming out of such conversations to say that he saw or heard something different. It is essential to have the presence there of impartial friends of all the parties and of countries that are economic partners in the region with all the countries involved and that have political, diplomatic and friendly relations with them.

66. Hence this morning [*2424th meeting*] we proposed that, in order to overcome the escalation of problems between Honduras and Nicaragua—above all the possibility of a conflict in the area between forces of the two countries—the process of bilateral talks be accelerated. We proposed specifically that the Presidents or heads of State—the Co-ordinator of the Governing Junta, Commander Daniel Ortega Saavedra of Nicaragua, and President Roberto Suazo Córdova of Honduras—meet in the presence of the Presidents of Mexico and Venezuela, who are good friends of both countries, so that they can attest to the good will of both countries and their willingness to reach agreements, as they would also be witnesses to the agreements that are reached at each meeting so that at following meetings it might not be said that such agreements were not reached.

67. One could not accuse Venezuela or Mexico of being partial towards Nicaragua or partial against or in favour of Honduras. We believe that this is important, and if there is good will on the part of the Governments of Mexico and Venezuela to participate as witnesses to this process of dialogue with Honduras, then the process will move forward. If any country has any problems regarding participation, then there might be some other country that wants to serve as a witness, but this is a fundamental requirement of any serious process of dialogue and negotiation, above all in a region where there are such high levels of tension and distrust among countries.

68. Furthermore, we wish to point out that Nicaragua is not underestimating regional dialogue. Nicaragua considers that it is important that there also be, parallel to the bilateral dialogue with Honduras, a regional dialogue which tackles the entire complex problem of the Central American region. We believe that in the discussion of the regional problem it is obviously important that, among countries with high levels of tension, differences and distrust, there be third-party countries of the region to bear witness to the level of agreement reached and to the positions stated. This is why we have reiterated that we are prepared to participate in initiatives such as that of Contadora, where countries of the region in proximity to Central America, such as Mexico, Venezuela, Panama and Colombia, have begun to work. We reaffirm that as far as the regional discussion is concerned, which is being promoted in this forum, Nicara-

gua is prepared, next week if possible, to respond to any appeal that might be made by the four countries that initiated the Contadora measures.

69. In connection with the United States, we reiterate that this is also a decisive factor in the regional situation and in the threat to Nicaragua. That is why this morning we proposed a direct, immediate dialogue with the United States. It is true that we have not proposed an intermediary or a witness, as far as the United States is concerned, but this is because in the last two and a half years, when we have been proposing to the United States Administration that we should meet, on every occasion there has been a refusal to engage in a dialogue. When we proposed, one year ago, that Mexico should be a witness to such talks between Nicaragua and the United States, the United States purely and simply rejected the idea of Mexico's presence as a witness. Because of this Nicaragua has proposed the very least that could be proposed: that we engage in direct dialogue, without witnesses, in any place that might be acceptable to United States officials. That is what we proposed this morning.

70. We believe that those three lines of dialogue and negotiation are fundamental if we are really to progress towards finding a solution to the Central American crisis.

71. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Venezuela. I invite her to take a place at the Council table and to make her statement.

72. Mrs. CORONEL de RODRÍGUEZ (Venezuela) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Sir, I should like to express, on behalf of my delegation, our congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council. We wish you every success. Through you I should also like to convey to the representative of the Soviet Union our most cordial congratulations on the excellent work he accomplished as President of the Council last month.

73. Venezuela wished to participate in this meeting of the Council requested by the representative of Nicaragua because we consider that today it is increasingly urgent for us to seek formulas of understanding to put an end to the grave problems facing the peoples of Central America. We have listened with interest to the statements by the representatives of Nicaragua and Honduras. Many countries have expressed their views and their hopes that peace may take root in that region of the Earth where for almost five years now a constant battle has been waged.

74. Mr. Luis Herrera Campíns, the President of my country, in the speech he made in Nicaragua on 19 July 1982, on the occasion of the third anniversary of the Sandinist revolution, which he attended as the only head of State invited to that event, stated that there had been no peace initiative or measure in which Venezuela would not have participated.

75. Venezuela has been accompanied and is accompanied today by many countries that are genuinely interested in the quest for stable and lasting peace. Suffice it to mention the initiative taken by the Presidents of Mexico and Venezuela, taken up at the meeting on 8 and 9 January 1983 on Contadora Island by the Foreign Ministers of Colombia, Mexico, Panama and Venezuela[1] and which the Dominican Republic expressed its wish to join during the recent visit to Caracas by its Foreign Minister Vega Imbert.

76. These efforts are hampered by the participation of other interests that are more concerned with their own hegemonic positions than with the establishment of effective and genuine peace.

77. The Central American countries are not arms producers. Their economies are weakened, not only by the world economic crisis, but also by a long war of considerable proportions and repeated natural disasters such as earthquakes and floods, and because of the terrible scourge of terrorism and sabotage that affects the vital centres of their economies with the purpose of bringing chaos and destruction to them. Within this disastrous economic situation we see an alarming increase in the levels of war materials, military and paramilitary contingents and irregular forces in the region. We therefore have to ask ourselves: Who has been supporting that situation of confrontation for so long? If all statements in favour of peace are sincere and if those who make them are acting according to what they preach, how is it possible that such a situation of confrontation continues day after day?

78. We have to conclude that these statements are part of a verbal exchange, a form of confrontation with the Security Council as its scenario and where mutual accusations replace a new but at the same time ancient form of fighting.

79. Peace in Central America cannot be reached through the Security Council, which already demonstrated its inefficiency during the Malvinas conflict last year. The interests of the super-Powers inhibit the action of the Council and place the Central American problem in terms of East-West confrontation. When this situation arises the Central American peoples cease to be protagonists in their own destiny and become pawns in a chess game where the interests of peace are far removed.

80. We consider it essential for the solution of the conflict that direct talks should take place among the countries of the region, and we are prepared to offer our own assistance and co-operation so that they can begin. We know the difficulties that mutual distrust places in the path of dialogue. This is why we stress Latin American channels, free from outside intervention or that of the super-Powers or middle-sized Powers. Our presence, as witnesses or promoters of dialogue, is intended to encourage a meeting free of propaganda or raised voices. If that meeting is to bear fruit, what we previously referred to as a verbal exchange must be discarded. The mutual accusations that have been put forward in the Council are not a path towards the establishment of a constructive dialogue.

81. In the face of the statements made by the representatives of Nicaragua and Honduras, Venezuela feels compelled to invite them, together with the other Central American countries, to begin a prudent and frank dialogue that will enable the restoration of trust, the only effective path towards the achievement of peace.

82. We have always affirmed that Latin American problems must be resolved by our own family of peoples, without foreign interference. The internationalization of the conflicts does not in any way help the comprehensive solution of the crisis in Central America. We do not want—indeed, we reject—the hypocritical positions of those from other continents who request for our countries what they forcefully reject for their own countries. Venezuela has never sought any type of "help" from outside the continent which cannot solve the political and military problems of an area vital to it, as is Central America.

83. Consistent in our rejection of war, terrorism and violence and in support of free popular expression and genuine democracy, which is not imposed by weapons but rather is brought about by the genuine desire of the citizens expressed through the vote, we have supported all initiatives aimed at the institutional normalization of the area and at the search for sincere agreements among the States concerned with the goals of reducing weaponry, eradicating terrorism and strengthening the climate of peace.

84. But all of this must be done within a Latin American framework. All of the initiatives, even though they have not been fully successful, have had positive prospects for the reduction of tension. There have been initiatives of a bilateral and multilateral nature. Today, together with other friendly countries, we are promoting the high-level meeting for peace and disarmament in Central America, with the presence of Central American countries, in addition to the presence of five countries acting as witnesses in good faith. One of those witnesses of good faith will be Venezuela. That meeting should take place as soon as possible. Such an initiative is in no way an obstacle to any other procedure that the States concerned may wish to promote within the regional framework. But we insist that this is not the place, by promoting the internationalization of the conflict and increased interference by the major Powers in matters involving our peoples to defend the cause of Latin America. It is in Latin American forums and with Latin Americans as protagonists that we should consider the situation in Central America in its overall complexity.

85. In Central American territory, in the city of Masaya and in Nicaragua itself, the President of Venezuela made a clear appeal to pluralism as the genuine way of achieving peace. The unfortunate violence which is today rending the nations of Central America can be eliminated only through the exercise of genuine democracy. This was stated by His Holiness Pope John Paul II in his historic visit to the area. In recent days, we also have affirmed this and we will continue to say this and act upon it. we have, with good cause, supported all the processes of free election that have taken place in the area, and we continue to support those that are planned.

86. I wish to conclude by repeating the words spoken by the President of the Republic of Venezuela on the occasion of the third anniversary of the Sandinist revolution, to which I referred at the beginning of my statement:

> "For Venezuela, it is a profound aspiration that lasting peace be achieved in Central America, that threats cease, and that people be able to dedicate themselves to education, to work, to the promotion of cordial relations, without having to arm themselves in order to guard against possible surprise attacks."

87. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Bolivia. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

88. Mr. SALAZAR PAREDES (Bolivia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): This is the first time that the constitutional and democratic Government of Bolivia is speaking before the Security Council. It is therefore an excellent opportunity to record once again our profound democratic convictions and our firm support for the Charter of the United Nations, of which we were among the original signatories.

89. Allow me first of all, Sir, on behalf of the Bolivian Government, to congratulate you on your presidency, which we are convinced will contribute to obtaining results commensurate with the purposes in the Charter.

90. We have followed with close attention the statements made in this forum by the representatives of Nicaragua and Honduras, both brother countries with which we have ties of close friendship. My Government cannot gloss over a matter as serious as the one which brings us here together in the Council and has given me instructions to express its concerns in this connection. This is not a concern which stems from the circumstances of the present day, but rather the result of our commitment to the norms of international law.

91. As early as 1 December of last year, on the occasion of his visit to the Organization's Headquarters, the President of my country, Mr. Hernán Siles Zuazo, in his speech to the General Assembly, affirmed:

> "The grave crisis affecting the brother countries of Central America is a cause of deep concern for my Government. Tension, threats and escalating violence are all factors in the conflict which is developing and becoming more complex in that region. The foundations of peace are being constantly and increasingly weakened and, because of a lack of vision and understanding, the threat of war is arising. What is necessary is respect for the sovereignty of each and every country of the region and of their right freely to dis-

pose of their natural resources and carry out changes in their political, economic and social structures. It is now more important than ever before that the principles of non-interference and self-determination are respected, if a conflagration in Central America, which could so easily extend beyond those frontiers, is to be avoided. The situation calls for initiatives in good faith such as that of Mexico and Venezuela, which have opened prospects for a peaceful political solution. The peoples of that region have already suffered too much under totalitarian régimes to have to suffer now the horrible scourge of war."[2]

92. Today we would seem to be at the threshold of that terrible scourge to which the President of Bolivia referred. Nicaragua has described what that country considers to be a serious increase in acts of aggression against its sovereignty. Honduras, for its part, has rejected the accusations and has referred to the internal situation prevailing in Nicaragua. Similarly, other countries have echoed that reasoning concerning the internal policy of Nicaragua which, according to them, might be the cause of that dangerous situation in Central America.

93. Bolivia is a democratic and non-aligned country. Therefore we wish clearly to state the need for respect for the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of other States. In the Council we have heard, and not without concern, several lines of reasoning inconsistent with the Council's function, which is to guarantee rapid and effective action for the maintenance of peace in times of danger. The reasoning we have heard, however, runs counter to the principles of the Charter, which does not authorize any Members to intervene in matters that are essentially within the internal jurisdiction of States.

94. In this context our substantive position is in line with the documents adopted in New Delhi this month at the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries [*see S/15675 and Corr.1 and 2, annex*], of which we are Vice-Chairman, in the sense that the processes of change taking place in Central America cannot be attributed to an East-West ideological conflict. That simplistic vision makes a secondary issue of the anguish of social justice that exists in Central America and throughout the third world, which in the majority of cases is not ideological in nature, as the vying Powers would claim. The desire to achieve a quality of life more consistent with our aspirations can in no way be taken as an excuse in any way to destabilize any Government, especially if the peace and security of an entire region is jeopardized.

95. In cases such as the one before us a military solution is no solution. Perhaps it would seem to be the easiest way out for those who do not participate directly in the scourge of war but actually cause it. In the long run that type of operation is difficult to resolve when the conflict widens and is prolonged. Therefore my Government has taken a very favourable view of the peace initiative presented by the Governments of Mexico and Venezuela, the proposal of the Governments of Colombia, Mexico, Panama and Venezuela, and the recent initiatives presented before this very Council.

96. I have precise instructions from my Government to state our most forceful rejection of any type of intervention from any source and our most energetic condemnation of the violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of a State.

97. We state that most forcefully because we ourselves experienced a huge territorial aggression that deprived us of sovereign and useful access to the Pacific Ocean. Today, after more than 100 years we still suffer the consequences of that aggression against our territory.

98. We are confident that the Council can benefit in some way from the statements we have heard here. In any event my country, Bolivia, wishes cordially to appeal to our brothers from Honduras and Nicaragua to make every effort to find a solution to the situation that has caused us to gather here and is of such concern to us.

99. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Belgium. I invite her to take a place at the Council table and to make her statement.

100. Miss DEVER (Belgium) (*interpretation from French*): At the outset, Sir, we should like sincerely to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Council.

101. My Government was hesitant to speak in this debate because it believes that when a problem is brought before the Security Council it is primarily up to the members of the Council and the parties directly concerned to speak. It is not a good idea to encourage the tendency towards a proliferation of statements by non-members of the Council and to a prolongation of deliberations. However, bearing in mind the need to maintain a balance of opinion in the discussion, we have requested the Council to hear us and we thank it for having acceded to that request.

102. Belgium has been following with disquiet the turn of events in Central America and the escalation of violence that has engulfed the inhabitants and impedes the social and economic development essential to ensure peace and justice in the States of the region.

103. My country is deeply committed to respect for the basic principles of the Charter regarding non-interference, non-aggression, the sovereignty of States and human rights. We welcomed with satisfaction the fall of the Somoza Government and the chance it offered to establish a democratic régime in Nicaragua and to enable populations to enjoy their proper rights. We regret that the hopes aroused have not thus far been fulfilled.

104. Throughout this debate we have heard accusations and counter-accusations, but we have also heard protestations of good will, offers for negotiations and references to proposals made by the countries of the region to seek a solution. The path that should be followed is the seeking not of a military solution but of a political solution that would restore peace and security to all the coun-

tries of the region and guarantee respect for human rights. Thus we support the peace initiatives made, in particular, by the contries of the region, and we oppose any actions that can only poison a situation that is already disquieting enough.

105. We have recalled the basic principles of the Charter. We would urge all parties concerned to respect them by putting an immediate end to violence and by embarking on negotiations through which we believe the regional organization, the Organization of American States, could certainly make a substantial contribution.

106. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Brazil. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

107. Mr. BUENO (Brazil): Mr. President, I wish to thank you and the other members of the Council for having promptly acceded to my delegation's request to participate in this debate.

108. Allow me, Sir, to extend to you our congratulations on your assumption of the presidency and our appreciation of the efficient and distinguished manner in which you have conducted the business of the Council during the current month.

109. A large number of delegations, in particular those from the Latin American region, have intervened in this debate to state their deep preoccupation with the situation in that area. The Brazilian delegation also wishes to express its grave concern regarding the growing tensions in Central America. In so doing it has in mind the good and fruitful relations Brazil has developed with all the countries in that region which observe the principles of sound international behaviour.

110. My statement is inspired by a long-standing tradition of Brazilian foreign policy which pursues mutual trust and respect among nations, the instruments of which are constructive dialogue and the search for peaceful understanding.

111. The principle of the non-use of force should be strictly observed in today's areas of tension. It is the duty of all States—not only of the more powerful ones—to refrain from acts or attitudes that would contribute to heightening international tensions. It is necessary to circumscribe these tensions to their specific causes and to try to solve them on the basis of the national interests of the countries involved, free from any outside interference.

112. There can be no topical solutions to the problems which have been undermining the stability and development of Central America. In facing those problems we cannot minimize the historic, social, political and economic components of the present crisis in the region. And we cannot isolate the difficulties of Central America from the world economic crisis.

113. In our view a lasting solution to these problems can be achieved only if we rely on the wisdom contained in the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations. Time and again Brazil has reaffirmed its adherence to the basic principles of the Charter, which call for respect for the national independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of all States, non-intervention and non-interference in the internal affairs of States, non-recourse to the threat or use of force and peaceful settlement of disputes. Such principles are equally the backbone of the inter-American system.

114. We still have time—and this should be our main task—to stop and to reverse the escalation of violence in Central America. Only if we do so will it be possible to concentrate efforts to help find solutions to the deep-rooted economic and social problems in the region.

115. I cannot stress it too strongly: the resolution of the present conflict must follow the path of moderation, constructive dialogue and political understanding.

116. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of the Dominican Republic. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

117. Mr. KNIPPING VICTORIA (Dominican Republic) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Please allow me first of all to say how pleased my delegation is, and how pleased I myself am, to see you, Sir, as President of the Security Council at this very delicate juncture. Your presence here is in itself a guarantee that our discussions will be inspired by objectivity, good judgement and, above all, wisdom. We also wish to extend our congratulations to your predecessor, the representative of the Soviet Union, for the brilliant way in which he led the Council debates during his term of office last month.

118. The delegation of the Dominican Republic is appearing before this organ of the United Nations—which has among its functions and powers the primary responsibility of maintaining international peace and security—deeply concerned at the recent events in the Central American region. The turn that situation is taking adds an element of danger that could lead to the failure of all the enormous efforts being exerted by the peace-loving countries of the Latin American region to create an atmosphere conducive to bringing the parties to the conflict closer together, an atmosphere of peace, of the trust that is absolutely essential to bringing about a negotiated political solution that can eliminate those conflicts and make it possible to study, objectively and in depth, the social causes from which they derive.

119. The prerequisite is that peace be restored. Without peace there can be no political, economic or social development. Peace must be the great consensus of nations and must constitute the common good of mankind. Peace must be the result of international social justice.

120. As representatives of a country which believes in peace and social justice, we cannot be insensitive to the tragic situation our Central American brothers are experiencing. Out of allegiance to Latin American solidarity, we have repeatedly appealed to the parties to the dispute

to reach a ground of understanding and to discuss between themselves possible peaceful solutions to the present crisis. It pains us to see so much bloodshed.

121. In accordance with that principle of Latin American solidarity our Government has offered its territory as the site for a meeting of all the countries of the Central American region, a meeting which would also include the presence and friendly participation of those Latin American countries that have been expressing their legitimate concern at the serious events in that region. In other words, that meeting would exclude no country of the area, since it would be folly for the parties involved in the dispute not to sit down at the negotiating table.

122. The Dominican Republic attaches such importance to a peaceful and negotiated settlement of the dispute that the first act of foreign policy of the Government of national concentration that guides the destiny of my country, the Declaration of Santo Domingo—which was signed by the heads of Government of Venezuela, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, Belize and the Dominican Republic on the occasion of Salvador Jorge Blanco's taking the oath as President of my country—states that "the rejection of a violent solution and the acceptance of negotiation and dialogue are indispensable to the political settlement of the crisis, which should be the result of a shared effort and common will, with the ultimate goal of promoting and implementing democracy, economic development and social justice". That same Declaration issues a cordial appeal to the countries concerned with the strengthening of peace to exercise their good offices towards attaining that noble goal.

123. Along those same lines we wish to point out that the Government of the Dominican Republic was the first to speak out in support of the peace initiative taken by the Presidents of Mexico and Venezuela. With reference to that initiative, our Minister in his statement at the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly said that "the Dominican Government did not confine itself to simple support but expressed its willingness to participate, in whatever useful way it could, without detriment to the principle of non-intervention, in any effort to normalize relations" between Nicaragua and Honduras.[3] Furthermore, our Minister stressed:

> "For the Dominican Republic it is not Utopian to believe and to say that the Central American and Caribbean region must become a zone of peace, of balance, stability, pluralism and the total rejection of military solutions."[4]

124. We believe that the time has come to begin that fruitful dialogue. We must not allow the situation to reach an extreme that will make it impossible for reason, good judgement and civilized coexistence to prevail.

125. Our country, which enjoys a democratic system recognized by the international community and which maintains excellent relations with all the countries of the Central American region, reiterates its willingness to contribute to the urgent search for a negotiated solution. On that basis and given the delicate and disturbing development of events, we reaffirm our support for an immediate meeting of all the parties involved in the dispute.

126. We believe that this last condition is essential for the meeting to achieve objective and effective results and so that it may not suffer the fate of other meetings which, because they excluded certain parties, could not achieve the desired goals.

127. All the means for the peaceful settlement of international disputes must be used. The use or threat of use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State must be avoided. There must be respect for the principle of the self-determination of peoples. We should stress the principle of non-interference in matters that fall essentially within the internal jurisdiction of States, the guiding principle for harmonious international relations. Lastly, we wish to reaffirm that for the delegation of the Dominican Republic any political settlement of the Central American conflict must be inspired by and placed within the framework of the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

128. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Yugoslavia. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

129. Mr. SILOVIĆ (Yugoslavia): May I join other speakers in congratulating you, Sir, on the assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of March. I am confident that your proven diplomatic skill and personal qualities will contribute to the successful outcome of the deliberations on the item on the Council's agenda. I should also like to express my delegation's appreciation of the successful discharge of this very important duty by your predecessor, Mr. Troyanovsky of the USSR, who guided the Council's work with competence last month.

130. The Council is meeting again at the justified request of Nicaragua to consider the latest escalation in the infiltration of anti-revolutionary forces from Honduras into the territory of Nicaragua. We have been alerted to the impending danger by various sources, including the mass media. We particularly appreciate the information and analysis presented by the representative of Nicaragua to the Council at the 2420th meeting, as well as in his later statements. They enable us to understand the gravity of the situation, its causes and possible grave consequences.

131. We believe that what is in question is not a mere dispute between two neighbouring countries or their temporary misunderstanding. It is obvious that causes of tension which have recently increased so dramatically are much deeper. They are to be found in the historical contradictions that affect the whole region of Central America and the Caribbean.

132. One of the main features of the present time is the aspiration of peoples to emancipation, political and

economic liberation, the exercise of the right to decide freely and independently without interference or imposition of foreign will their destiny and their socio-economic system.

133. The longer and greater the social injustice and foreign direct or indirect domination, the more exacerbated the conditions in which changes occur. The revolutionary transformation which has taken place in Nicaragua was an authentic expression of the will of its people to become free of the dictatorship which had brought about injustice, social inequality and poverty and had to a great extent depended on foreign support.

134. Changes resulting from historical necessity and the right to equality, dignity and development of humanity towards a society wherein all segments of the population would constructively participate in establishing a more just system cannot be denied, and even less stubbornly undermined by pressures, threats or infiltration of groups of armed terrorists. It is evident that such groups cannot survive without foreign political and economic support, that is, without direct assistance, since they have no stronghold in the country itself. These groups are obviously being trained and launched from outside. Such pressures and assaults against the sovereignty of any country, as is the case with Nicaragua today, lead to an increase of tension and political polarization in this and in any other region.

135. The international situation is burdened by the policies of blocs which tend to divide the world into spheres of influence and interests, thus leading to further intensification of rivalry under various pretexts and to the prolongation and increase of tension.

136. Arrogation of the right to intervene in arbitrarily proclaimed zones of vital, special or any other interest, according to whatever criteria, nurtures the logic of such behaviour and necessarily leads to its escalation. Such policies carry constant danger of new interference and shift the rivalry to ever new areas. This not only denies the sovereignty of States and the right of peoples to independent choice of decision, but also threatens peace and security in wider regions, not only in Central America but also in other continents.

137. The non-aligned countries, aware of the danger that can result from such a development in Central America, held in January this year an extraordinary ministerial meeting of their Co-ordinating Bureau dedicated exclusively to the problems of that region. The meeting was also an expression of solidarity of non-aligned countries with Nicaragua's determination to confront all threats and to maintain its own independent way. The Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, recently held at New Delhi, the largest gathering of non-aligned countries so far, also attached great importance to the situation in Central America and in the Caribbean and assessed it as grave and tense. The non-aligned countries condemned in particular the increase in threats and attacks against Nicaragua and called for the cessation of all hostile acts against that country. They called also upon all countries to refrain from acts and policies that might increase tension in the area, and they reiterated that the principle of non-interference and non-intervention in Central America, as well as in all other regions of the world, should be strictly abided by. They stressed again their opposition to all forms of foreign domination, pressure, threats and imposition of foreign will upon independent countries. They demanded full respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity, independence and the right of all peoples freely to decide their own destiny.

138. A number of constructive proposals and initiatives have been submitted concerning the situation in Central America, of which Nicaragua is part and parcel. Among them is the Contadora initiative by Colombia, Mexico, Panama and Venezuela from January this year,[1] as well as the earlier ones by Mexico and France and by the Socialist International, as well as a number of others. The value of these proposals lies in the fact that they proceed from an overall perception of the situation and aim at a comprehensive political and peaceful solution based on negotiations, excluding the use of force and taking into account the existing situation, necessities of social development and justified demands for national and political emancipation.

139. Yugoslavia, together with other non-aligned countries, supports such an approach to the solution of the multiple problems in the area. We believe that it is the best way to overcome the existing difficulties, to avoid further aggravation of the situation, to curb foreign interference and to establish peace in this exhausted region ridden with crises. Nicaragua has made and is making efforts to find a peaceful solution. It has many times expressed readiness to negotiate, has put forward proposals in that direction and has reacted positively to those mentioned earlier and to some others. Yugoslavia supports this position of Nicaragua and calls upon all involved and concerned parties to contribute to the search for a negotiated settlement in the interest of peace and security in the region as well as in the world at large. We support the right of the people of Nicaragua and of other Central American countries, as well as of all countries and peoples in the world, to undisturbed development, free from foreign pressure and interference.

140. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Honduras has asked to speak in exercise of his right of reply, and I now call on him.

141. Mr. ORTEZ COLINDRES (Honduras) (*interpretation from Spanish*): It is, indeed, not as a customary expression of diplomacy that we should like to extend our Government's thanks for the patience and attention with which these 15 countries of this deliberative body, the supreme body of the United Nations, are conducting these deliberations. The seriousness with which you, Mr. President, have guided this debate will be recorded some day not just in the records, but also in the annals of Central America's quest for peace.

142. The hour is late, so I shall address myself to the crux of the question. The Honduran Minister for Foreign Affairs would have liked to fulfil this responsibility, but as is logical and just, we know that there are rules and norms that must be respected and we have learned how to wait our turn and at the same time to try to be positive.

143. After having heard the interesting statements of a large part of the international community, I could say that we are approaching an analysis of the problem into well-identified parts: internal problems, international problems and dialogue for peace.

144. With regard to the first aspect of the problem, if I were not to provide some information the situation might not be clear, and we would not want this to happen. We shall do our best and not dwell on details, because otherwise the Council would become some sort of peace tribunal or a mini-General Assembly, and it seems to me that when the Council was created that was not the intention.

145. As for the internal questions involved, Nicaragua and some countries friendly to it have asserted that what is happening in that fraternal country is not an internal problem. The statistics on how many persons have died in Central America over the last three years reveal that it is no exaggeration to speak of 100,000 lives lost, and it is our Nicaraguan brothers who have lost the most, I would say some 40,000. As to the Salvadorans, I believe that we do not exaggerate when we say that about 30,000 have died. That makes 70,000. And among the deaths that were not reported there must be another 30,000. That round figure is no exaggeration.

146. When General Somoza's downfall took place and the Sandinist revolution triumphed—I was one of its most ardent admirers, and I publicly defended it in my country at the union and university levels and in those forums in which the will of the people is reflected—there arose in Nicaragua a phenomenon which had repercussions in my own country, namely, a mass migration of 25,000 Nicaraguans seeking refuge after 40,000 persons had been killed in the internal conflict in Nicaragua. Those 25,000 Nicaraguans are still in Honduras, and the Nicaraguan exodus is increasing further with the internal problem in Nicaragua. I have precise figures: every day some 100 persons cross the border, some 600 to 700 persons every week, as the result of Nicaragua's internal problem. Our country has seen this figure swell to 45,000 refugees. Among the 25,000 Nicaraguans are 6,000 Miskitos indigenous to the border area of Nicaragua. Those Miskitos—and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees can attest to this—do not want to return to Nicaragua. They have been asked whether they want to return to the homeland from which they fled, and they answer that they do not.

147. If they answered that they did and the United Nations offered to protect their lives, thus freeing us from any responsibility as to what might happen, then we would have no objection to providing trucks so they could go back to Nicaragua, to the place whence they came. Why do they not wish to return? Are they on vacation? Have they gone to Honduras to spend Christmas or Holy Week with relatives? It is easy to find the answer: it is because there is no respect for the rights of the ethnic minorities, who rightly fear being exterminated. That is easy to see, because many of the leaders of Miskito groups are in El Salvador trying openly to establish counter-revolutionary movements.

148. I now come to the second internal aspect. I ask in absolute honesty and sincerity: What have we Hondurans to do with the fact that the wife of the man who opposed Somoza for 20 years—Pedro Joaquín Chamorro, who died of a gunshot wound—who was rewarded with the Presidency of the Junta by the revolutionaries; Mr. Arturo Cruz, who, when I was President of the Central American Bank, was my chief of operations for eight years and an honest and brilliant man who had three positions in Nicaragua: member of the Junta, ambassador of the Sandinist Government of Nicaragua in Washington and President of the Central Bank; and Alfonso Robelo, three members of the Revolutionary Junta, denounced the Junta and organized to struggle against the Government today in power in Nicaragua? What internal problems have we been causing the Nicaraguans so that those persons have gone over to the other side in disillusionment?

149. Today [*2424th meeting*] my Minister mentioned—and I do not wish now to go into petty details—the official notices of Nicaraguan censorship which can be provided to the newspapers; they are official and bear a seal. When the Minister comes to speak of peace, that is completely censored. Press censorship is such that only one newspaper is left, that of Chamorro's widow, and the censors lose all sense of proportion, because of what they have censored, which I shall bring to your attention: the arrival day of my Minister; and the photograph showing ex-President Carter with Brezhnev, who had died a day earlier, giving him a hug. Those are problems they wish to blame on us.

150. The representatives of Nicaragua need have no fear; I shall not tire them; I wish to maintain my sense of respect for them. I have a file which is but an introduction to the acts of aggression committed against us by Nicaragua. I shall read out 10 of them, or fewer, because to go through the entire list would be to show a lack of consideration for the members of the Council. As I said, this is not a court or a peace tribunal, but a most esteemed forum. But I must bring some of these facts before the Council, for were I not to do so—members know that in international law silence grants consent—only one side of the coin would be seen. I shall try to be as brief as possible.

151. In January 1982 a Sandinist patrol pursuing some smugglers crossed into Honduran territory and there came upon a Honduran patrol and exchanged fire for five minutes: violation of our national territory and

harassment of our national army. That occurred in the Palo Verde sector, co-ordinates 0757 on the map of Concepción de María, department of Choluteca. This is just one random example.

152. On 4 March elements of the Sandinist army entered the Guapinol sector and kidnapped citizens Cornelio Rubio and Daniel Gonzáles, taking away their boats. Those two persons were kidnapped: violation of our territorial waters and kidnapping.

153. On 17 March, at 11 o'clock, Sandinist elements attacked elements of the Honduran navy, wounding Corporal Mario Roberto Ramos: violation of our territorial waters; aggression against a Honduran patrol. Co-ordinates 13° 05' 45"; wounded: Mario Roberto Ramos.

154. On 17 March, in the afternoon, two Honduran boats were captured in territorial waters facing the Miskito village of Irlaya. A Nicaraguan coast guardsman shot at the Honduran boat *Debbie K,* taking away its captain and 24 fisherman members of the crew.

155. On 17 March the fishing boat *Baby Jones* was attacked by a Nicaraguan ship and towed to a Nicaraguan port with all its crew: violation of territorial waters. Kidnapped: Longino Cruz, Ligio Ordoñez, Horacio Sandino, René Flores, and others.

156. On 18 March, Sandinist elements penetrated as far as the community of Raya, 30 miles within Honduran waters, capturing 48 fishermen and the *Derveequee,* kidnapping them and taking them towards Nicaráguan waters. Kidnapped: 48 fishermen from the community of Raya, 30 miles within Honduran waters, in the Atlantic.

157. On 21 March, at 1400 hours, a communication was received at the naval base of Puerto Cortés from the naval station of Islas del Cisne to the effect that two patrol boats of the Sandinist forces had entered Honduran waters, capturing four Honduran fishing boats and taking them toward Puerto Cabezas in Nicaragua: violation of territorial waters.

158. I shall not go any further in this regard so as to avoid having it all transcribed and causing further expenditures to the United Nations.

159. Accordingly, I hope that no one will be impressed by Honduran or Nicaraguan attacks, for there are files and dozens of notes which in the last eight months—since I have been ambassador—I have sent officially to the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council. We are causing internal problems.

160. Shots are being heard today where they were heard last week—in a town which, for those who know Central America, is called Matagalpa. Matagalpa is not on the border with Honduras; it is at least 150 kilometres from the border with Honduras.

161. I shall refrain from mentioning all the attacks carried out today and which are reported from Costa Rica, on the southern front, which is far from Honduras—that is, some 200 to 300 kilometres from the border. It is inconceivable that these problems should be purely internal problems. It is clear that they have international repercussions.

162. Let us clarify the confusion about the meeting at the highest, presidential, level, between Mr. Roberto Suazo Córdova and Mr. Daniel Ortega Saavedra. I have in my possession notes that have just arrived. They are voluminous and I shall not read them into the record. In these notes, dated 16 September and 11 October 1982, which will be transcribed to authenticate the truth of the statements and words of a responsible Government, President Suazo Córdova agrees to talks, even bilateral ones.

163. What has happened? Where is the change? I have explained to the Council why the President was unable to attend on the date set because of the kidnapping of 100 citizens and because of the enormous rally expressing civic support for him. I was in Honduras at the time, and we talked with his staff and his advisers. One's teachers teach one something. I had some good teachers, in practice, who told me: "Never leave your President exposed; never expose the fundamental part or the stability of a region by preparing a meeting of Presidents badly." When what is at stake is the peace or destiny of a country—or of Central America, as is the case now—a meeting organized hurriedly and in a rush can cause great disillusionment, even if good will is present. Consequently, in these notes, my President tells the Presidents of Mexico and Venezuela—witnesses whom I too regard as honourable and whom I accept as honourable, as Nicaragua accepts them, and I accept them now, as we accepted them the last time—that this meeting must be successful and must not be a mere show that will complicate the world's image and create false expectations for our peoples For Presidents lose prestige when they meet at the highest levels and spend time exchanging solely and exclusively liquors, cocktails, Coca-Colas and photographs; Central America is not for that sort of thing. That is very dangerous. We are a young Government; we have taken 20 years to elect a president and we cannot tarnish him through an international failure, with negotiations lacking seriousness and sound preparation. Therefore in these notes he tells the Presidents: "We wish to accept this bilateral dialogue." Yes, we have no fear of bilateral dialogue. Why should we? If this is nothing more than a bilateral and regional problem, there are two sides to the coin and we want to talk about both of them.

164. For that dialogue to culminate in a responsible agreement to which we subscribe, one which is prudent, logical and sincere, we propose a meeting of the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the Central American countries. That is how the Hague Conventions of 1899 and 1907 and the Atlantic Treaty were prepared. The heads of State did not just sign the Treaty of Versailles without their ministers and advisers informing their respective Presidents of the seriousness and gravity of the points and drawing up a formal, serious agenda enabling the

success of such a meeting. The principle is still valid today.

165. My Government does not slight Presidents. That would be irresponsible on our part. I was at the 1973 Guyana meeting when the Presidents of Mexico and Venezuela—during the big oil crisis when a barrel of crude oil went up in price from $2.50 to $12.50, leaving Mexico and Venezuela with a profit margin of $10—granted Central America, at the most difficult stage of the crisis, 15-year terms and 8 per cent interest financing to be used for infrastructure replacement and energy consumption in a situation that we were not prepared to bear. It would thus be illogical, impractical, amoral and lacking in gratitude on our part, and we are not like that. Therefore we are not trying to avoid the presence of these two high-level witnesses.

166. The problem, indeed, is greater. This is so true that a few minutes ago the representative of Venezuela—one of the countries suggested for the talks—read its proposal and I listened most attentively. She said that another meeting was held between that date and the present—the Contadora Island meeting. That meeting was not bilateral; it was not just Mexico and Venezuela, but Panama and Colombia also attended. We viewed this with great sympathy, and when those four Presidents, four Ministers and four Governments even took the initiative within the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries so that the Latin American countries would not be tied to blocs, encouraging the Latin American countries to forge their own destiny and, with a view to the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries at New Delhi, that we unite with the independent world, Nicaragua was opposed. The countries that are trying to censure us here objected to our being included as observers, but thank God we are allowed to speak in this forum. We should have liked to have participated as non-aligned. Yet there were countries that spoke against Honduras defending itself in the non-aligned bloc. Why? Because we are puppets of the United States; they can judge from a distance. We do not reproach those countries that are badly informed, but logically we want the participants in the dialogue to be those who are closely involved.

167. This proposal, made by Venezuela itself a few minutes ago, was made on the instructions of its Government. This is no longer the affair of two countries, as there were four in Contadora and now we are talking about five. But let us play cleanly. It interests us and we welcome it with satisfaction.

168. Out of international prudence and in order to help the Council to achieve consensus we shall not mention the names of those five, who could even be more. Yes, we want these countries that will be observers—these witnesses of high quality that we accept, from now on—to be democratic countries. We want this because it is impossible for us—countries trying to set an example to our peoples—to be observed by dictatorial Governments that do not possess the moral prestige to come and give us advice. However, as I do not wish to begin—nor does my Government—to sniff out and to judge who in Latin America is democratic and who is not, as this is a very dangerous subject, we accept now that it shall be recorded that we want and encourage this dialogue and that if we do not mention the Latin American countries that should take part in it this is because we do not wish to muddy the waters in passing and we do not want any regional or continental interest to say to us: "Ah! That country is not democratic; it is a dictatorship." Then the dialogue collapses through a judgement that is extremely difficult to handle.

169. But we reiterate that our position is to accept the dialogue. I am happy, Mr. Deputy Minister, that your words are changing a little in substance. You are an intelligent man and a man who has fought in all disputes. You have defended your country with devotion. You were a guerrilla who passed through my territory, I am sure. And if it was not you, because I cannot prove it, I can speak about another hero, Commander Zero. Those men who crossed like you, who forged the victory, were not supported by the Honduran Government; they passed through blind spots on the border. We were not able to control them, did not want to control them. They crossed and overthrew a régime without the complicity of the Government of Honduras. I think that this is a virtue.

170. We as Hondurans must protest this, because when we hear the statements of our allies in peace in the region, such as Panama and Mexico, we note citations as though there exist some articles about what lending of territories or fomenting instability constitutes. I can only hope, since no countries were mentioned, that no one in the region wants to accuse us of actions of that nature.

171. We believe in Mexico and Panama and we do not want to confound our thought. Comments have been made to the effect that, directly or indirectly, Honduras is implicated in officially wanting to destabilize Nicaragua. I repeat: we have faith in Panama; I repeat: we have faith in Mexico; I repeat: we have faith in Colombia; I repeat: we have faith in the Dominican Republic. I have mentioned them by name; there is no taint or bad thought involved.

172. We do not want to say in whom we most believe until a position is taken, so as not to create confusion on what could constitute the bases for a forum of five, where five countries of Central America would be seated, without, of course, exclusion of any Central American country with Latin American observers. I underline the words "Latin American" because possibly my emphasis of this might appear to some as complying with orders from the American Government. But even if some think that we are North American puppets—which we are not—I emphasize that the position of Honduras is that in this dialogue the observers should be Latin Americans, not because we feel there is suspicion attaching to the United States. Just as we have respected the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and have seen the intelligent stance

they have taken, we have seen the talent of Mrs. Kirkpatrick. We know the great responsibilities that they bear; while we are engaged in gun battles, they are discussing invisible missiles. It is logical; that is the nature of the world. But we do respect the Security Council and we are not expressing falsehoods here.

173. Consequently, I should like it to be clear that Honduras views sympathetically, without any exclusion, a meeting of the five ministers. If it is so desired, it can be a meeting of presidents, with no pre-conditions, the five presidents of Central America. And if they want observers from democratic Latin American countries, we accept that, too. The only thing we ask, out of a sense of responsibility to our Ministers for Foreign Affairs, to this forum and to ourselves as public servants, is that the meeting be prepared properly, because there are already 100,000 dead. These are no longer merely rumours. And if these appeals at the highest level come to naught, the world forums remain; when this body—the Security Council—meets, it is because the crisis is being considered so serious as to create a threat to international peace and peace in a region.

174. We believe that instead of coming to a body such as this to ask that we be separated, that each of us be put back in his corner, as unfortunately has happened with the countries of the Middle East and as happened in the case of the thirty-eighth parallel, we should act in a different manner. That is not what we want. We are prepared to have it put on record that we are in favour of all these intentions of the democratic peripheral countries and that we are grateful to them for their desire to aid us in this labour of peace.

175. Let us endeavour to be constructive, because that was my promise. Instead of exchanging accusations and counter-accusations, why do we not clarify key points so that the Council can take note of the points of agreement?

176. I have not been clear, Mr. Deputy Minister for External Relations of Nicaragua, on one point. And I should appreciate, whenever you deem it appropriate, your telling us if you are prepared to accept a regional dialogue, with no restrictions, of the five Central American countries—with five additional countries or, if you wish to add more, whichever you may mention, because those that have been mentioned deserve our highest consideration—to discuss bilateral and multilateral problems. Because we are not going to escape from this circle simply by saying that this is a bilateral problem and not an internal problem. No. The problem is complex: it is bilateral, regional, internal and international. Consequently, we are going to speak without any restrictions. As of now—let us emphasize this—we are prepared to accept that dialogue. Five and five, as the representative of Venezuela just said, and observers in addition. Honduras' condition: that they be democratic in nature. We do not mention them, but we would like, for the reasons noted and in order to give seriousness and credibility to the meeting on the continent and in the world, that régimes be sought which respect legality, which respect the laws and the institutions of their countries as a result of free elections. I do not want to make judgements about which Government is democratic and which is not.

177. Secondly, Mr. Deputy Minister, we want to be clear that when we are speaking of "no restrictions"—and we would like to know your feeling on the subject when you deem it appropriate—we shall then discuss general disarmament, international supervision of armaments and of border zones—not just patrolling of borders—supervision and control of ports, airports, sensitive points, dangerous and sensitive areas where there are weapons, where there are strategic points: those things that every country has, no matter how small it is. And we declare and emphasize that, for the record.

178. That is why my Minister came today, because these are very serious commitments. I am an ambassador who respects the laws of my country. My Minister, Mr. Paz Barnica, has already said this, or wanted to say it, this morning, but as a result of procedural problems he was not able to make this statement. However, I am authorized to make it on his behalf and on behalf of the President of the Republic.

179. We are prepared to accept disarmament; we are prepared to accept international supervision and control, provided that the reply of the Deputy Minister is affirmative. Obviously we cannot be so naïve in international practice and theory as to allow our territory alone to be supervised and controlled. That is why we take the multinational approach.

180. The disarmament we are talking about is substantial disarmament. What do we mean by substantial? All these things must be made perfectly clear. Somebody has to establish the amounts and the limits that indicate when a country has an offensive army and offensive weapons. Technical experts would analyse this. I am not going to decide the matter, but this substantial disarmament should establish the reality or the bases for living in security, in peace, in harmony, respecting the rights of others and the principle of non-intervention, being trusting and sleeping safely.

181. I have enormous admiration for a fraternal country, Costa Rica. It is already in the fifth or sixth democratic round. I have told the Costa Ricans that I admire their democracy. We wish we could all be like the Costa Ricans. Who would want Costa Rica to arm itself? But techniques have changed. Our ambassador in London sent me a letter reminding me of the fall 30 years ago of Jacobo Arbenz Guzmán, in 1954, when, at age 20, I was attorney for the strikers. In those days students went out to make something of themselves. We no longer have students; we have graduates, we have Ph.D.s.

182. In the University of Honduras we found—and this has been publicized—torture chambers, masks, printing-presses, subversive material, bombs. And our soldiers did not invade the university, though all Hondurans knew that the seeds of dissent were there, and that there were enormous numbers of kidnappings.

183. On 24 December the daughter of the President of Honduras was kidnapped. Our army fired not a single shot. Never has it fired on any guerrilla movement for a kidnapping. Even with guerrillas we have respected the law. No Honduran citizens have seized our aircraft; they have been Salvadorans, or Nicaraguan citizens—Salvadorans and Nicaraguans who have seized our cabinet and the daughter of our President. I was in Tegucigalpa when the medicine needed by the country spoiled: refrigerators did not work because a technical guerrilla unit had bombed our power plants. Because of a guerrilla movement our entire capital was blacked out for 15 days at a time when we were making enormous efforts to build hydraulic power plants and to find a way out of the poverty in which our people live.

184. I would ask another question—not to open discussion of a problem of give and take, but because these are essential parts of possible negotiations—whether your country, Mr. Deputy Minister, is, as is mine right now, prepared to remove its foreign military technical experts. Let everybody leave: the North Americans, the Cubans, the extra-continentals. Let us play clean. We are ready to agree to this. Therefore in due course I should like to hear the views of your Government on these points so that the peace efforts each of us is making may be on record.

185. Nicaragua has referred to our President, the chief of foreign relations of our country. It said that when that gentleman was elected in popular elections positive expectations regarding Nicaragua and its people and its system were created. I personally happened to receive Commander Ortega Saavedra at the airport when he arrived for the presidential inauguration. It is true that there were expectations. I remember seeing him loaded with weapons when he arrived at the airport. He was afraid that we in Honduras would do something to him. When the aircraft had come to a halt he said he would not disembark unless it was with his people. Our Government said no: if he had no faith that our Government would live up to its word, that was a matter for regret, but the Honduran Government would provide security. He agreed. There was no incident; there was a civic celebration.

186. Mr. Deputy Minister, when Somoza fell we all believed in the great expectations of the Sandinist movement, but I regret to tell you that you have radicalized them. Totalitarianism has seized you. We have no political prisoners.

137. In one of your replies you told me that I had made a numerical error because the problem at the border was a simple one. I had said there were thousands of kilometres; you said it was only 700. It is as though you have used a 50-millimetre photographic lens rather than a zoom. In return I shall use a zoom lens. Let it focus both ways. And these are not digressions; these are figures.

188. My country has thousands of kilometres. Those who study international law, and any person who looks at Central America, even the reporter from *The New York Times*, to whom we shall refer and to whom we shall reply regarding the photograph that appeared in that newspaper today, must realize the problem of its borders. We had a border which, thank God, was settled legally by arbitration with Guatemala. It is an enormous border, more than 700 kilometres.

189. In Guatemala there is a guerrilla movement. We have in Honduras Guatemalans who have crossed the border, just as Nicaraguans and Salvadorans have. We have borders with El Salvador. They are territorial and fluvial: the Rio Motagua, in the case of Guatemala; the Rio Lenta, in the case of El Salvador. When Commander Ortega Saavedra was here last, he said—and we can look at the record to see if I am mistaken—that there had been a violation of the fluvial border at the Rio Motagua. The Rio Motagua forms the border between Guatemala and Honduras, not between Honduras and Nicaragua.

190. We have one 700-kilometre border, part of which was fixed by the Gámez-Bonilla Treaty and by an arbitration decision handed down by 14 members of the International Court of Justice, 13 in favour of Honduras and 1 in favour of Nicaragua, which clearly and categorically laid down our borders with Nicaragua.

191. But when I mention that dossier, I must add that we also have thousands of kilometres of borders, because we can look at it another way: there is the Atlantic Ocean and the Pacific Ocean; we are an interoceanic belt, a vital point. Were the Americas a woman, Central America would be her waistline. It is there that the trouble is, in the waist of America, for no chain can be stronger than its weakest link.

192. If only to correct the impression that we are referring solely to border patrols, in addition to the vessels and people who are in Nicaragua that were captured from us as a result of so many incidents, we must add another border, the air border, which is being violated. That astronomical border, which can be projected upward *ad infinitum*, as high as planes can fly, has been violated too. The international news services, as we know, have informed us that the land borders have been violated; we have truckloads of captured weapons, freight cars full of weapons. The guerrilla movement now exists also in El Salvador. I do not understand why we do not *echar la vaca*—a common expression meaning to group together against an adversary. This is not to say that Nicaragua must be an adversary, but it is a problem that they have and that we have and, with God's help, we may reach agreement and these problems may disappear. That border is being violated: press releases mention Salvadoran units in the department of Morazán; official statements of the Government state that aircraft and small planes from Nicaragua are overflying our territory and landing to reinforce the Salvadoran guerrillas. I have no intention of interfering with the Salvadoran guerrillas or with anything else. I am just stating what is going on: that when airspace is violated it is a border violation. And that is why I speak of thousands of miles of border.

193. Why is our Foreign Minister not here to reply? That deserves some explanation. He would wish to have replied, perhaps in a less emotional manner than I. But we respect international commitments. We accept this one, but we also have a regional and continental commitment. Both Nicaragua and Honduras are members of the Organization of American States, and article 23 of its charter clearly states that States members of the OAS should exhaust the resources of that regional forum before turning—and that charter states this specifically—to the Security Council. The Foreign Minister will make his statement tomorrow morning in Washington at 11.30 a.m.

194. So let us land from this flight of the *Columbia* in order to come to something positive at the end. The refugee problem is enormous. I do not know how the refugees cross the border when the news that we receive is that you have mined the border. There is a state of emergency in Mocorón; I do not know how they manage to get across, but they do.

195. So, to sum up: we continue to affirm that the problem has profound domestic implications in the case of Nicaragua. Regarding the one remaining accusation, I did not wish to take the past six minutes to speak about the first page of *The New York Times*. In a forum such as this, we cannot arrive at our opinions on the basis of what one reporter says that another reporter told him, and so on. However, since the accusation was made in this forum we have telephoned the President of the Republic. And he said: "Tell the Council that we are immediately sending a commission of inquiry, and if we find any camp at all we shall not only destroy it but capture and punish all those in it, whether they be Hondurans, Nicaraguans, foreigners; they will be subject to Honduran law, and the Government guarantees that. We do not support such camps."

196. Can the President's word not be believed? Let us then, I say again, go into what we have agreed to—namely, international supervision of the problem, so that independent parties can have their say and see that their decisions are implemented.

The meeting rose at 7.10 p.m.

NOTES

[1] See A/38/68.

[2] See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-seventh Session, Plenary Meetings*, vol. III, 84th meeting, para. 31.

[3] *Ibid.*, vol. I, 33rd meeting, para. 53.

[4] *Ibid.*, para. 58.

Litho in United Nations, New York 00400 60205—July 1990—2,050

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم . استعلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب إلى : الأمم المتحدة ، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف .

如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.

Litho in United Nations, New York 00400 60205—July 1990—2,050

59